THEOLOGY

A MONTHLY REVIEW

VOL. XLI. No. 241 JULY, 1940

Pacific School of Religion Berkeley, Calif.

Baptismal Disgrace - - *Alec R. Vidler*

Memories of Modernists—I. - *J. F. W. Boden-Worsley*

Retaliation or Reprisals? - *Charles Smyth*

Christianity and Poetry - *T. S. K. Scott-Craig*

The Sunday Offices and the War - *Kenneth N. Ross*

The Journals of Søren Kierkegaard - *John Short*

The British Chaplaincy at Lisbon - *H. F. Fulford Williams*

Survey:

Christian Social Thought - - *W. G. Symons*

For full list of contents see within.

Edited by Alec R. Vidler at St Deiniol's Library, Hawarden, Chester, and published by the S.P.C.K., Northumberland Avenue, London, W.C. 2.

1s. per copy. 12s. per annum, post free.

33270

THEOLOGY

Editorial communications should be addressed to: The Rev. Alec R. Vidler, B.D., St Deiniol's Library, Hawarden, Chester. (MSS should not exceed 4,000 words, and should be accompanied by a stamped and addressed envelope.)
Business communications (including books for review) to: The S.P.C.K., Northumberland Avenue, London, W.C. 2.

Advisory Committee

The Rev. Canon F. A. Cockin.
The Rev. L. J. Collins.
The Rev. F. L. Cross, D.Phil.
The Rev. Prof. Norman Sykes, D.Phil.
Ashley Sampson.

Collaborators

(The following are in general sympathy with the aims of *Theology* and are willing in various ways to give it their assistance, but they are not committed by the editorial policy in particular matters.)

Montgomery Belgion.
The Rev. Canon J. S. Bezzant, B.D.
Prof. T. S. R. Boase.
F. Brittain.
Leonard Browne, M.D.
Miss K. E. Chester.
The Rev. A. A. Cock.
The Rev. F. N. Davey.
The Rev. H. S. Deighton.
E. W. Edmonds.
T. S. Eliot.
Miss D. M. Emmet.
Bro. George Every, S.S.M.
The Rev. A. M. Farrer.
The Rev. S. L. Greenslade.
The Rev. Prof. L. W. Grensted, D.D.
The Rev. H. StJ. Hart.
The Rev. H. C. L. Heywood.
The Rev. Prof. Leonard Hodgson, D.D.
The Rev. Canon H. L. Hubbard.
Prof. M. V. C. Jeffreys.
The Rev. Canon W. L. Knox, B.D.
The Rev. F. E. P. S. Langton.
The Very Rev. the Provost of Leicester.
C. S. Lewis.
The Rev. Prof. R. H. Lightfoot, D.D.
The Rev. Ronald Lunt.
Donald Mackinnon.
The Rev. Prof. F. S. Marsh.
The Rev. E. L. Mascall.
The Rev. Guy Mayfield.
The Rev. F. H. Amphlett Micklewright.
The Rev. T. R. Milford.
J. Middleton Murry.
The Rev. Arnold Nash, M.Sc.
Joseph Needham, Sc.D.
The Rev. A. Otter.
The Rev. Prof. O. C. Quick, D.D.
The Rev. Prof. A. M. Ramsey.
The Rev. E. C. Ratcliff.
The Rev. Alan Richardson.
Michael Roberts.
The Very Rev. the Dean of St Paul's.
The Rev. George Seaver, B.D.
The Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of Sheffield.
John Short.
The Rev. Canon Charles Smyth.
The Rev. A. M. Stockwood.
The Rev. Prof. R. V. G. Tasker, B.D.
Miss B. Hamilton Thompson.
The Rev. Oliver Tomkins.
Miss Evelyn Underhill.
The Rev. C. D. Waddams.
Gilbert N. Walton.
The Rev. M. A. C. Warren.
Charles Williams.
The Headmaster of Winchester.

Editorial Representatives in U.S.A. (to whom MSS and communications from American writers should be sent):

The Rev. W. Norman Pittenger, General Theological Seminary, New York.
The Rev. Powel M. Dawley, Ph.D., St David's Church, Roland Park, Baltimore.

Collaborators in U.S.A.:

Prof. George R. Elliott, Litt.D.
The Rev. Canon John Crocker. [S.T.D.
The Very Rev. Hughell E. W. Fosbroke,
The Rev. Leicester C. Lewis, S.T.D.
The Rev. Charles W. Lowry, D.Phil.
Prof. William A. Orton.
Allen Tate.

Other Representatives Abroad:

Ireland: The Rev. Prof. R. R. Hartford, B.D., Trinity College, Dublin.
South Africa: The Rev. C. H. S. Runge, C.R., Rosettenville, Johannesburg.
N. India: The Rev. J. R. Peacey, Bishop's College, Calcutta.
S. India: The Rev. T. G. Stuart Smith, C.M.S., Tholashery, Tiruvalla, Travancore.
Australia: The Rev. G. Stuart Watts, 90 Pitt Street, Sydney.
Japan: The Rev. C. K. Sansbury, Central Theological College, Tokyo.
Canada: The Rev. R. K. Naylor, Diocesan Theological College, Montreal.
China: The Rev. G. F. Allen, Union Theological College, Canton.

THEOLOGY

VOL. XLI JULY, 1940 No. 241

Baptismal Disgrace

I LATELY came upon this sentence in a novel: " She was a large vague lady, who seemed to spend her days in forgetting what she had just done, and meaning to do something which she never had time for." It is a sentence that may be applied without injustice and, I hope, without impropriety to the Church of England, not to mention other churches, in regard to the theology and practice of baptism.

In the theological section of a library, with which I have reason to be familiar, there is a whole stack of books on the subject of the eucharist. On the shelves reserved for the subject of baptism there are precisely twenty volumes, none of which was published since 1925, and only two of which were published in this century. This fact is a symbol of the neglect into which the subject has fallen. It is not to be accounted for by the supposition that everything that can profitably be said about the theology of baptism has been said long ago, and that therefore the subject is worked out. The fulfilment of that condition in the case of other subjects does not prevent new books from being written about them, and we can hardly believe that it would do so in this case. And even if the theology of baptism were a closed subject, the manifest deficiencies in the baptismal practice of the modern Church might have been expected to secure the voluminous attention of Christian authors.

Is, then, the neglect of the subject to be accounted for by an unavowed and maybe unconscious fear of the embarrassing consequences that would ensue upon a close attention to it? Is it because the elucidation of theological principle with regard to our existing baptismal practice would impel us to disturbing and unpopular action that we have found it easy to pass by on the other side?

I am not unwilling to learn that there is some other explanation of the apparent equanimity with which practices that do not seem to bear a moment's scrutiny are tolerated, but I have not been able to discover any other explanation. I have, however, recently derived some encouragement

from the discovery that among the younger clergy there are some—perhaps many—who are determined to think this matter out and, so far as it lies within their power, to bring practice into line with principle.

When I was myself a parochial clergyman, my conscience was uneasy on this score. Since I have been detached from the parochial ministry, and have been able to view the matter more disinterestedly—that is, with less bias towards rationalizing professional conduct which an established convention required of me—I have been increasingly sure in my own mind and also have been reassured by others that this concern is not a personal idiosyncrasy that may be lightly lulled to rest or a silly scruple resulting from an early prejudice in favour of ecclesiastical discipline which I have failed to outgrow.

In this, as in other matters, no wise action is likely to be initiated unless it is preceded by careful thought both about general principles and about the realities of the present situation.

If we turn to Holy Scripture, as we are bound to do, we are met by the initial difficulty that the teaching about baptism which it contains refers apparently to the baptism of adults, whereas our problem to-day is connected with the baptism of infants. I intend to keep my remarks close to that connexion, but I would first observe that the theology of adult baptism is comparatively straightforward and its practice comparatively free from anomalies.

Baptism is the outward and visible means by which a person, who repents and believes the gospel, is born again, is incorporated in the mystical body of Christ, the community of the redeemed; becomes a member of " an elect race, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a people for God's own possession " (1 Pet. ii, 9). It is true that these grand, familiar phrases, which may be predicated with manifest suitability of the Church as it was in New Testament times, cannot with equally manifest suitability be predicated of the Church as it is to-day in this country. I do not know that it would occur to anyone to describe the Church in this country as " a royal priesthood " or " a holy nation," unless such phrases were prescribed by a venerable tradition. At present they do not very clearly apply. Still, we wish that they did, and we hope that they will, and we may even believe that in some profound, mysterious sense they do apply.

Baptism, thus understood, is a momentous occasion in a man's life. Convicted of sin and of the mercy of God, he thereby receives the outward and visible assurance of God's pardon, and is publicly admitted a member of that divine society in which the powers of the kingdom of God are at work and in which the promises of God are being fulfilled, a society both in the world and distinct from the world, a society which makes upon him demands and secures to him blessings which are neither acknowledged nor covenanted elsewhere.

It is when we turn to consider the theology and practice of infant baptism that the particular problems plainly arise to which I wish to call attention. If infants were baptized at all in New Testament times (which is quite doubtful), it was as members of Christian households. Adult baptism was the norm, and infant baptism was exceptional, and it continued to be so with certain variations of custom until the so-called establishment of the Church under Constantine. But with us infant baptism is the rule, and not the exception, and as a matter of course we baptize children who are born into households which even the most brazen latitudinarian would hesitate to call Christian. What, then, do we believe about baptism? The grace of baptism is said, in the Church Catechism, to be " a death unto sin, and a new birth unto righteousness." How is that so in the case of infants? In the case of adults, the baptized have actual sins for which they are penitent and of the forgiveness of which they are by means of the sacrament consciously assured. But infants have no actual sins, nor are they conscious of any benefits received.

What about original sin? Does that need to be forgiven? Far be it from me to deny that sombre truth about our human condition which the unhappily chosen term " original sin " is designed to assert. We cannot, however, assert it now in quite the same form as our forefathers did. In their view the doctrine of original sin was dependent on an historical fall of Adam, on the literal truth of the story in the Book of Genesis. Christian theology is handicapped by a failure to have reasserted this doctrine in a form that commends itself to the intelligence of those who are willing enough to acknowledge the truth which it expresses. Clearly, there is no shortage of material out of which to reconstruct the doctrine of original sin.

What, however, is less clear is that, when the doctrine

has been thus reaffirmed, we shall still be able to attribute to infants sins which need to be forgiven or guilt which needs to be remitted. If new-born infants were guilty before God and in danger of condemnation to hell or only in danger of going to limbo (whatever that may mean), and if baptism were the only means known to us by which that guilt could be remitted and that danger averted, then obviously it would be a duty to baptize as many infants as possible. We ought in that case to baptize infants not only as indiscriminately as we do at present, but far more indiscriminately. We ought to imitate the curious stratagems said to have been employed by the Jesuits in North America, who, under cover of conversation with the parents, would secretly flick a few drops of water on a child, as they whispered the baptismal formula.

On the other hand, if, as I maintain should be the case, the only children to be baptized were those born into a household or the household of faith, it would still be true to say that baptism is for the remission of sins, but in a somewhat different sense—namely, in the sense that by baptism the infant is admitted into the redeemed community, the community whose characteristic function it is to receive, witness to, and mediate the forgiveness of God in Christ Jesus. Baptism is the rite by which children enter this community, but the rite is significant and its potency becomes effective only if it is followed up by education within the community.

Tertullian quaintly said: "We little fishes, after the example of our great fish Jesus Christ our Lord, are born in the water, nor are we in a state of salvation except by abiding in the water." The Church has no right to allow children to be born in the water unless it has taken every possible step to see that they are going to be kept in the water. Baptism is the supernatural means by which children are declared to be children of God and enabled to live under His kingly rule, but it is this on condition that upbringing in a Christian home or within the Christian family is assured. It is the initiation of churchmanship or it is a sheer anomaly. Divorced from its consequences and treated as a separable rite, it is deprived of its proper significance and effect, and admits of no theological justification. The word "magic" might be applied far more appropriately to the popular attitude to baptism than to any forms of eucharistic devotion, and bishops who wish

to regiment their under-shepherds and their flocks would find better scope for disciplinary action here than there.

It is true that the judicious Hooker and the most esteemed Anglican divines of the seventeenth century held, when the question was raised whether the children of unbelieving parents ought to be baptized, that they ought to be. And within the terms of the motion as it then stood they were right. For, on the one hand, the point then in dispute was whether the regeneration of infants in baptism was dependent on the holiness of their parents—that is, on human merit—or whether it was due to the unmerited mercy of God. And, on the other hand, in those days it could reasonably be assumed that the children of unbelieving parents would be brought up as Christians. If they were not born into *a* household of faith, they were born into *the* household of faith. The national Church with its all-embracing parochial system could be relied upon to do in general what particular parents might fail to do. Those conditions no longer hold good. Our national society as a whole is not now a part of the household of faith. We cannot presume that children, whose parents are not living as members of the Church, will nevertheless in the ordinary course of events be brought up to do so themselves. We have, alas ! every reason to presume the contrary.

In our present situation, ecclesiastical discipline must take account of the character of parents and of the home in which baptized children are to be brought up. God-parents may still have valuable functions to perform, but pious godparents are no substitute for indifferent parents. Any proposal to deal with this matter merely by attempting to secure better godparents and by ignoring the parental question is a futile compromise which is designed as an excuse for reluctance to take more radical action. The meagre and miserable Report on the Administration of the Sacrament of Holy Baptism, recently issued by the Joint Committee of the Convocation of Canterbury, falls under this condemnation.

I must now turn to consider some of the objections that will be raised against the practical proposals which would result from an endeavour to act upon the theological principles which I have asserted.

First, it may be said that, while theoretically it may be difficult to justify our present practice, yet it is the genius of Anglicanism to subordinate logic to life, and one must

be prepared for some anomalies in any church system, and anyhow it is a good thing that people should respect the Christian religion if only to the extent of wishing to have their children baptized. To that class of objection I would reply, first, that I do not dispute the genius of Anglicanism, but just because that is its genius, the abuses to which that sort of genius is prone want watching for all the more carefully. Secondly, I agree that there will be anomalies in any church system, but that is no reason for acquiescing in any and every anomoly, and the question here is whether we have not to do with an anomoly which ought not to be tolerated any longer. Thirdly, with regard to the question of retaining what respect is shown for the Christian religion, anyone who takes the theology of baptism seriously will see at once how derogatory it is to the sacrament simply to use it as a device for retaining respect for the Christian religion. Moreover, if indiscriminate baptism is held to be a good way of making or keeping contact with people who otherwise do not come to church, why should not the holy communion be treated in the same way? I have yet to learn that one sacrament of the gospel is more sacred than the other. Yet there are, I believe, Anglicans who adopt a rigorously exclusive attitude to the admission of devout Nonconformists to holy communion in *all* circumstances, and who at the same time are willing to baptize children from non-Christian homes in almost *any* circumstances.

Secondly, the objection may be raised that it will be unreasonable to restrict baptism to the children of parents who "communicate at the least three times in the year," if indeed that should be the test, and at the same time to go on marrying non-communicants in church. With this I agree, but I deny that it is an objection. I would add that, if our baptismal discipline is to be reformed, it should be accompanied by a reformed discipline in regard to confirmation as well as marriage.

Thirdly, it will be said: Why make the children suffer because of the sins or shortcomings of the parents? But the child will suffer anyhow from the lack of a Christian home; baptism, so far from preventing that, will only camouflage it. Or it will be said that we have no right to refuse children the benefits of baptism. We should remember the text: "Suffer the little children to come unto Me." This objection springs from sentimentality. There is no benefit in baptism out of the context of churchmanship.

Fourthly, it may be said that the theology of infant baptism which I have asserted reduces the rite to the status of a dedication service. In answer to that I would be content to quote a passage from an essay by Principal Micklem:

"Baptism is not a Dedication Service (he writes), nor can it be replaced by any such. At a Dedication Service it is the parents who are the agents, at a Baptism it is Christ through His Church; at a Dedication Service it is the parents who declare what they will do, at a Baptism it is Christ who through His representative, the minister, takes the child in His arms and declares what He has done and will do for the child; at a Dedication Service it is the parents who promise, at a Baptism it is Christ. . . .

"But (he adds), Baptism is meaningless unless the child is received into, and to be brought up in, the household of faith."

There is another objection, to which I have no confident answer, which may be decisive, and which I will mention in a moment. I want in conclusion to consider what prospect there is that action will be initiated on the lines that have been indicated. It may be thought that we ought to wait upon the hierarchy for a lead; if that were given it would probably be more effective than any other course that can be proposed. But the bishops, it seems, are kept much too busy amid many obstacles in keeping the existing ecclesiastical machinery running to take an unprompted lead in radically reforming it, especially at a point where little hard thinking has been done by their advisers and which they may shrewdly and justly suspect would add a fresh hornets' nest to their difficulties.

May we then look to the inferior clergy not merely to talk and to agitate but to act—or even to the laity? The laity at present have little say in the conduct of church affairs, except the few who find clerical company and a clerical outlook congenial. I have been led to suppose that there is a number of the inferior clergy who are giving much thought to this matter and whose opinion is hardening in favour of taking some such provocative action as might force the issue to a head. It is interesting to observe that keen sensitiveness to this issue cuts across all the older party alignments in the Church, just as all schools of thought have been equally offenders in the past. It may be that we should need to see some clergymen being persecuted or giving up their livings for faithfulness to theological convictions about baptism before the conscience of churchmen

would be sufficiently stirred to forward a general reform of ecclesiastical discipline.

It would be the duty of any clergyman who despaired of being given a lead and who felt impelled to take such action as was open to him in conjunction with others who had a similar determination, not only publicly to explain what he proposed to do and why he proposed to do it, but also privately to interview all parents who sought to have their children baptized. He would try to show them that "baptism is meaningless unless the child is . . . to be brought up in the household of faith," and that in existing circumstances there can be no assurance that this will probably happen unless at least one of the parents is living as a member of the Church. Would it be disingenuous for him to recall that an Englishman is not a hypocrite? He means what he says, whereas apart from this condition the baptism service involves saying what he does not mean.

This would have to be done with a resolute conviction, but also with sympathy and discretion, for it is not the parents who are to blame for the present state of affairs. The whole Church, and not least the clergy themselves, are to blame. It is only as part of a penitent and radical endeavour to reform the discipline of the Church that the abuses connected with baptism can rightly be approached. Such an endeavour would have to begin somewhere. It may be urged that the ministration of baptism, just because its theology has been so much neglected and would fall now upon practically virgin soil, and just because it is not at present a rallying ground of ecclesiastical party politicians, would be a suitable point at which to begin. Would not the raising of this issue force people to think theologically about the whole meaning of churchmanship? All the chief Christian doctrines are involved in the theology of baptism. The application of a new discipline as to the conditions under which infants may be baptized would sooner or later touch and judge most homes in the land, or at least most of that decreasing number of homes into which children are born.

There remains, however, the objection to which I said that I had no confident answer. This objection is that if a movement from below towards a stricter baptismal discipline began to succeed it would be likely soon to fall under the control of upstart and narrow-minded ecclesiastics, and the broadly-based theological principles at

stake would be lost to sight in the fumes of sectarian fanaticism. In that case the last state would be worse than the first, if indeed that be possible.

That objection may be decisive. Nevertheless, in one way or another we must assert that the Church depends for its true life not on its popularity, nor on its numbers, nor on the efficiency of its organization, but on its faithfulness to the Word of God. Upon that depends its moral power, which to-day is conspicuous by its absence. A Church which set about taking itself and its principles seriously would be an offence to many; it may be that in the present situation the Church will have either to become an offence to many or to cease to count for anything.

The whole drift of the modern state is towards a secularist totalitarianism. Only a Church which has a clear apprehension of its calling and function and which expresses that apprehension in a strong and consistent discipline has any prospect of surviving or even of being martyred. It would be foolish to suggest that a reform of the Church's sacramental discipline would by itself reintegrate the Christian religion with the life of the whole community. But the least we can do is to prepare the way for a regenerated Church by removing and remedying the more flagrant abuses in our present ecclesiastical system.

ALEC R. VIDLER.

Memories of Modernists and Others

I—ALFRED FAWKES (1850-1930)

To Alfred Fawkes's surviving friends he is not only a figure of precious memory, to whom biographical justice has not been done;[1] but more than that, he was an extremely shrewd and wise old man, whose only obvious failure had been that he did not so anticipate the form of the Modernist crisis in the Church of Rome as to find himself back in the Church of England at an earlier date. In other words, it

[1] I do not overlook the excellent and favourable memoir contributed by Dr Major and others as a preface to the posthumous volume of sermons under the title, *The Church: a Necessary Evil.* But this was but brief, and left room for much more.

came too late; and the best years of Fawkes's life had been spent in the Roman Church, until he returned to the Church of England, which had been the spiritual home of his youth, at the age of all but sixty. His early youth had been correctly Anglican. He was at Eton immediately before Hornby's headmastership; at Balliol when Jowett became Master. He actually took Moderations in the year of Jowett's accession. But he never seemed to have much to say about Jowett as Master, although he spoke with a great veneration about his theological writing, which he (Fawkes) was fond of quoting. I always concluded from Fawkes's silence on the one point, and his emphasis on the other, that since in his Balliol days he was contemplating Anglican orders, he had not regarded with favour the liberal ecclesiastical and theological attitude of Jowett. But he was ever pressing upon me and others the excellence of Jowett's essays; and he bequeathed to me, among many books, a volume of Jowett's letters as a companion to the two volumes of the *Life and Letters* which I already possessed.

Fawkes's change of attitude is intelligible. He went from Balliol into Deacon's orders in the Church of England, but almost immediately was received into the Church of Rome, where he proceeded to Priest's orders, and remained for more than thirty years. In the later part of this long span he was contributing to the *Edinburgh* and the *Quarterly Reviews* the essays which afterwards were published in his large volume, *Studies in Modernism.*[1] It was, he said, his periodical appearances in these *Reviews* which had a part in causing him to be threatened with the Anti-Modernist oath, and so provided the pressure which was requisite in order to send him back to the Church of England. To this end he took counsel with Dr Hensley Henson, then a Canon of Westminster; and crossed, or recrossed, the Rubicon as henchman and friend of Dr Percival, Bishop of Hereford. He worked in Hereford diocese for a brief space until his appointment to the incumbency of Ashby St Ledgers, near Rugby, in the gift of Lord Wimborne. It might seem to be a curious coincidence that Fawkes should find himself at Ashby; for the ancient parish church stands almost in the precincts of the Manor House in which the so-called Guy Fawkes Plot was hatched. In Fawkes's day the political and polo parties, in which he was *persona grata*,

[1] Published by Smith, Elder and Co., 1913.

helped to swell his congregation. The antiquarian atmosphere of the church suited him well with its three-decker pulpit and its pre-Reformation seats; for Fawkes's "Modernism" did not take the form of modernizing ancient edifices by the common Victorian methods of vandalism and vulgarity. His small modern vicarage could hardly contain the voluminous library with which he lived and from which he sent his essays, articles and many musings into the print which provided his real pulpit. To this setting in which we see Fawkes—the ancient church, a dash of modern society and piles of books—we must add the presence of his niece, who was a most pleasant and capable hostess, and the beloved dogs who were his close companions. His European mind, his kindly presence, and his sharp, if nervous, wit were seen to fulfil in a fashion all his own the old proud boast, *Clerus Anglicanus stupor mundi.*

If we place Fawkes generically among the Modernists, we should note that in his Anglican days he expressed a preference for the terms Broad or Liberal Churchman. This was probably because he thought clearly; and, having known Modernism in its own home, he realized how different it was from the position of most Anglican liberals. It is true that he was sufficiently suspect within the Roman Church to earn the title; but those who knew him well would never have thought of him, in spite of his sympathy with continental theology, as a Modernist in the strict sense of the term. Indeed, in attempting any estimate of Fawkes, one is confronted at every turn with the difficulty of setting him permanently on any shelf with a party label.

In some respects, certainly in his idea of ecclesiastical order and the decencies of worship, he might perhaps have been described as a High Churchman. For while his interpretation of the Prayer Book in the matter of externals would be called Protestant, he applied it with High Church precision. He was not of the type of Liberal Churchman which greets a reference to the Ornaments Rubrick and the Canons with indifference or ridicule; and he could not bear with services in church which were slovenly or inadequately organized. Casting about for a form of words which would fit the anomalies of Fawkes, I thought of the term used by the Master of Jesus to describe his predecessor of the nineteenth century, Dr Corrie: "an Evangelical High Churchman, equally opposed to Popery and Dissent." But this will not quite serve; for Fawkes was more comprehensive, and would

have come to terms with either on a liberal basis. His Protestantism tended to throw him into alliance with Evangelicals until they realized the measure of what they would certainly call his "Modernism." This he discovered, and explained it in this way: that the Evangelicals applauded him so long as they did not understand him, but as soon as he became intelligible to them he lost their confidence. This distressed him, for he always maintained that the Evangelicals were "good men." He once caused great merriment in a small and appreciative company in the smoking-room at Auckland Castle by speaking quite seriously and (as he thought) favourably of some cleric whom he had met as "a High Churchman, *but* a good man."

With all Fawkes's apparent Protestantism there remained a Catholic and, as one might put it, a genuine and efficient devotional side of him which was quite unaffected by his return to the Established Church, and untouched by the rationalism of his mind and outlook. He would say that while the critical attitude was needed to save orthodoxy from putrefaction, its effect by itself was to miss the mystic vision, the things unseen and

> "The light that never was on sea or land,
> The consecration and the poet's dream."

Fawkes was fond of quoting verse, and was indeed himself a poet, although very diffident when one made the discovery and sought to know more. At the end of his essay on Historical Christianity he printed his own verse in summary of this liberal view:[1]

"There are more important questions than whether a man belongs to this or that Church, or holds this or that theological opinion; the Kingdom of God does not consist in these things. But while women are loved and men achieve, and children link heart to heart as they pass the lamp of life from generation to generation, its interests are secure. To idealize is the one thing needful; what we idealize is of less consequence, for in the idea all things are one.

> "Wherefore, thou,
> Worship the Power—in this all creeds agree—
> Which from Olympus speaks, or Sinai's brow,
> Or beams, diviner, from beloved eyes."

I knew Fawkes as a correspondent for the last twelve years of his life; in the flesh, and with increasing intimacy,

[1] *Studies in Modernism*, p. 340.

for the last eleven years. It was in the last year of the first Great War that we discovered each other. He was at Ashby St. Ledgers; I was in the Indian army, a layman, but interested in ecclesiastical affairs, and delighted by the Erastian flavour of Fawkes's pamphlet, *The Things that are Cæsar's*,[1] which found its way very near the North-West Frontier of India. When I returned from the Afghan War of 1919, and early sought him out, he had already reviewed a little book of mine in *The Spectator*. Thereafter we met frequently and exchanged visits. His last sojourn under our roof was only some two months before his death in 1930.

In the course of such a friendship one penetrated much beyond first impressions. But first impressions still remained ineradicable; and Fawkes was an impenitent Erastian to the end. Not only had he a very proper regard for law and the legal position of the Established Church; he also had a rooted conviction that the alliance of Church and State, with "the State as the predominant partner" (Fawkes's phrase), gave an adventitious advantage to freedom of theological enquiry; so that the fate of the Modernists in the Roman Church might have been very different in the Established Church of England. But Fawkes was a bundle of contradictions; or perhaps it might better be put that he was a repository of many affections, and that while these might have jostled one another, they generally found a reconciliation in his large embracing mind. He remained a close friend of Loisy to the end; it was his own choice and wish to be buried beside the grave of Tyrrell; but he quoted Harnack with conviction, and in the Prayer Book controversy he was allied with the late Bishop of Manchester, Dr Knox. Knowing well the Church of Rome, he knew by contrast the Church of England, as any must realize by reading his little book, *The Genius of the English Church*.[2] There was a side of Fawkes which was unconditionally Protestant, and at one point the Protestant might be thought to have excluded the Erastian. When an ecclesiastically-minded lady expressed to him the hope that he would introduce the Eucharistic vestments, he replied that he would use those vestments which were lawful in the Church of England—that is, he said, the surplice, the hood and the "scarf" (*sic*, *lege* tippet); for, to satisfy his Protestant sympathies,

[1] Published by John Murray, 1917. [2] *Ibid.*

he chose obedience to the 58th Canon of 1603, whereas a completely consistent Erastian would accept the Ornaments Rubrick as binding, because it has the force of statute.[1]

When Fawkes told me of the resolution with which he gave his answer to the lady I was reminded, and told him, of a great-uncle of mine who had inveighed to me against the Anglo-Catholic proclivities of his son in Orders. When I endeavoured to respond sympathetically he seemed to adopt a fresh front, for he said: " Of course I am not a Low Churchman; I like the High Church vestments." And when I enquired what precisely his grievance was, he said: " I don't mean the thing like a great turtle " (by which I understood him to mean a chasuble); " I mean their coloured tapes and what they wear on their backs, Oxford and Cambridge." This story delighted Fawkes, for—except for the details that he had ceased to care for coloured stoles and that the combination of a stole and a hood might be called a vestiarian solecism which dates itself in a past period—it visualized a general picture of Anglican externals as he would have had them be. He used to say that while the Elizabethan settlement comprehended a High Church and a Low Church aspect of the Church of England, it did not contemplate the latter-day developments of the Anglo-Catholic and the Anglo-Roman, which give to the mere High Churchman the colour of a Protestant. At the same time he held that once the Catholic position is admitted in the Church of England, in doctrine and ornaments, there is no logical limit to its development in line with modern Romanism. And yet again he would quote a wise and sober Roman, who observed that the Church of England seemed to be cultivating precisely those undesirable features of which the Church of Rome was striving to be rid. Fawkes had, I think, a shrewd perception of the strength and the weakness of both Churches. He would say that if " the Church of England rests on an appeal to sound learning," the Church of Rome flourishes on efficiency; and " if people must go to confession, a Jesuit is the least mischievous confessor they can find!"

[1] I do not think I ever heard Fawkes's reaction to the very interesting judgment in the action of *Gore-Booth* v. *The Bishop of Manchester and Another* in the King's Bench Division in 1920 (36 T.L.R., 464) *per* Lord Coleridge, J. But I fancy that the Protestant and the Erastian in Fawkes's make-up might have found themselves in somewhat embarrassed conflict.

Fawkes held the honourable position of a chaplain to the Bishop of Durham, Dr Henson, who once said to me that he would have wished to do something more for Fawkes, but that it was very difficult at his age—he was then seventy-three. "And then," he added, "he looks such an incorrigible old Roman."

Many of us were agreed that Fawkes deserved a pulpit and an auditory; but one of his difficulties was to make himself heard in a large church. His preaching and his estimates of persons and values were distinctive and distinguished, and deserve some measure of review. He was a very regular reader of papers at conferences of the Modern Churchmen's Union; and if, in view of his advancing years, he would quite literally have been covered by a friendly critic's description of the Modern Churchmen as "the ancient lights," he was himself the spokesman of eminently modern ideas. He was a shining light and a welcome wit, and at these conferences he might be seen surrounded by groups of admiring old ladies, who, even if they did but imperfectly comprehend his Latin quotations and his elusive style, were sound in their instinct that they were applauding a genius.

J. F. W. Boden-Worsley.

Retaliation or Reprisals?

The Mere Commemoration Sermon preached before the University of Cambridge on Tuesday, April 23, in St Bene't's Church

Romans xiii, 1, 4: "Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers: for there is no power but of God: the powers that be are ordained of God. . . . He [*i.e.* the power] beareth not the sword in vain: for he is the minister of God, a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil."

I

If there are at this time two documents which, more than any other, are a great deal talked about and very little read, they are, I suppose, the Treaty of Versailles and the Sermon on the Mount. And, in particular, there are three points about the Sermon on the Mount which are not, perhaps, generally appreciated. The first is that it is not addressed to the world at large, but only to the followers of the Lord, the Christians: and to attempt to patch the tattered garments of the world with isolated scraps cut out from our Lord's teaching will only make the rents a great

deal worse.[1] Thus you are not entitled to plead the authority of Christ (as you understand it) on the question of military service if you reject or ignore His authority elsewhere all along the line, particularly in the matter of public worship: for it is not allowable to take your Christianity *à la carte*.[2] It is perfectly true that war is contrary to the mind of Christ; but to some at least who use that argument it evidently means no more than saying that war is contrary to the mind of Buddha.

In the second place, the Sermon on the Mount is not to be equated or identified with "essential Christianity." Not only do we find it in its entirety in only one of the four Gospels, but also, as Bishop Westcott pointed out long ago, "The Sermon on the Mount is not Christianity; it is not a Gospel but a Law—the most perfect moral Law no doubt—but there is nothing in it to lift a man outside himself."[3] But Christianity is a Gospel: and "Christian ethics are bound up inseparably with Christian mysteries" (Fr Tyrrell).[4]

In the third place, the Sermon on the Mount is not a Pacifist manifesto, and only by a great deal of ingenious intellectual manipulation can it be so regarded or so employed. There is nothing in it that conflicts with the official teaching of the Church of England, that "it is lawful for Christian men, at the commandment of the Magistrate"—or, as we should say, the Sovereign—"to wear weapons, and serve in the wars" (Art. XXXVII). Most legislation, religious or other, restricts itself to the external sphere, and is content to demand right conduct. The Sermon on the Mount, which is for us the revised edition of the Decalogue, is concerned also with right conduct: but it demands a right motive first. Take, for example, our Lord's revision of the Sixth Commandment: "Ye have heard that it was said to them of old time, Thou shalt not kill: and whosoever shall kill shall be in danger of the judgment. . . ." It is hardly necessary to point out that the Sixth Commandment, which in the Prayer Book and in the Revised Version is correctly translated "Thou shalt do no murder," and which refers only to unauthorized killing, cannot conceivably be stretched into a prohibition

[1] *Cf.* H. L. Goudge, *The Apocalypse and the Present Age*, p. 88.
[2] *Ibid.* [3] Quoted in *Bishop Westcott*, by Joseph Clayton, p. 135.
[4] *Through Scylla and Charybdis*, p. 190.

of military service, if only for the reason that it was promulgated more or less on the eve of the military conquest of Canaan by the Israelites to whom it was addressed. But mark how our Lord continues: "But I say unto you, that whosoever is angry with his brother" (the words "without a cause" appear to be a later addition) "shall be in danger of the judgment." That is to say, He directs attention from the overt action to the inward motive, whether that motive issues in action or not. I have no wish to be uncharitable, but the study of Church history breeds a melancholy familiarity with the pathology of fanaticism, and it may pertinently be inquired whether you will not at this moment find more anger in the Peace Pledge Union than in the front-line trenches. The preoccupation with external conduct has its dangers for the Pacifist not less than for the Pharisee; and for the man who dislikes Pacifists not less than for the Pacifist. There is another text in the Sermon on the Mount which says, "Judge not, that ye be not judged." Actions, of course, we are bound to weigh and measure, but we should be very chary of imputing motives.

To sum up, then, the Sermon on the Mount, which is the New Law of the New Israel, is not addressed to the world, but to the Church; even so, it is not to be regarded as the very heart of Christianity; and it is emphatically not a Pacifist manifesto. It offers no encouragement to those who care more for the avoidance of suffering than for the vindication of right. As the late Professor Goudge wrote in 1935 in his memorable lectures on *The Apocalypse and the Present Age*: "We are too much afraid both of death and of pain, and fail to see that moral and physical evil are in no way comparable. We must not discourage the State from performing its God-given duty on the ground that under present conditions the horrors of war are too great to be endured. Nothing in the long run causes so much suffering as the tolerance of abominable wickedness."[1]

II

Now the modern world, which, although it would be very much astonished to be told so, has hardly the vaguest idea of what Christianity is about or why it matters, and

[1] *Op. cit.*, pp. 65, 124.

which, on this particular issue, appears to confuse Christianity with Buddhism, is fond of bringing against what it calls "the Churches" a double accusation: it accuses them, in the first place, of being officially committed to Pacifist principles; and it accuses them, in the second place, of betraying and abandoning those principles the moment that war breaks out. Thus Mr C. E. M. Joad permitted himself to write in *The New Statesman* (December 1, 1934): "For four years"—from 1914 to 1918—"the post-war generation had observed and participated in activities which, while directly violating every principle of the official creed of the Western world, received the blessing of its official exponents. Servants of the Prince of Peace in all countries and denominations were swept off their feet in a common enthusiasm in the service of the God of War."[1]

"But," as Fr Hebert points out in his little book on *Grace and Nature* (1937), "this whole identification of Christianity with Pacifism rests on a confusion with regard to Natural Law. Let us consider. The Kingdom of Christ is non-political: it is a universal, spiritual Kingdom, proclaiming a sonship of men to God through Christ. In the cause of this spiritual, universal Kingdom our Lord must suffer unresisting, and so must His martyrs in the early centuries and to-day. Where the Church in Russia is persecuted by the State, the Christians *may not* resist by force even when it means being put to death or sent to Siberia: the Church cannot use force without being false to its nature as the Kingdom of Christ. But the State *must* use force: it cannot refuse to use force without ceasing to exist as a State. And if the Church in the early centuries had put up an armed resistance to the persecuting Roman Empire, the result of a successful resistance would necessarily have been the setting up of a rival State; as when the Jews took up arms for the sake of religious freedom, and thereby won political independence."[2] The revolt of the Maccabees is, from many points of view, one of the most heroic chapters in the annals of the Jewish people, but its final outcome was the crucifixion of the Messiah.

The Church, then, may not use force: the State must. Is the State therefore necessarily non-Christian? It is sufficiently evident from my text that St Paul did not think

[1] Quoted in *Liturgy and Society*, by A. G. Hebert, S.S.M., p. 33 *n.*
[2] *Op. cit.*, pp. 15-16.

so: nor was that the teaching of Him who said not only, "Render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's," but also "If My kingdom were of this world, then would My servants fight." It cannot be contrary to the will of God that the right should be defended and that wickedness and cruelty should be punished. "To take vengeance is forbidden to us as individuals, not because it is wrong, but because it is God's: 'Vengeance belongeth unto Me; I will recompense, saith the Lord'; and we are neither His appointed ministers for taking it, nor suited to be judges in our own case. But such rough vindication of justice as the common life demands does belong to the State, to which God has committed it; and the State is 'the minister of God, an avenger for wrath to him that doeth evil.' It is the duty of the State to 'resist evil'; and the duty of its citizens to provide it with adequate means of doing so" (Goudge).[1] Nor need we suppose that the reference is only to problems of internal order, and that the State has no responsibilities within the family of nations of which it is itself a member. In the matter of Manchuria, Abyssinia, and Czecho-Slovakia, the Pacifists themselves were indeed conspicuously guiltless of any such assumption, however they may have been indisposed personally to implement their point of view, or to pay the regulation price for holding it.

But the word "vengeance" is admittedly repugnant to modern sentiment; and this is partly because, like the word "jealousy," it has acquired an evil meaning from the fact that with ourselves it is generally unjust. Yet vengeance and retribution are two words for the same thing, and in approaching the whole problem of reprisals it is necessary to distinguish between vengeance which is vindictive and vengeance which is retributive. The vindictive spirit is a temptation to us all, and when we suffer from the cruelty of others it is not easy for us to determine how much of our indignation is unworthy and self-regarding, and how much of it is impersonal and right. Yet notwithstanding we must not confuse with personal vindictiveness the desire that wickedness and cruelty should be punished, for that would be scrupulosity. Once more we are driven back to our Lord's own criterion, the criterion of Anger.

---

[1] *Op. cit.*, pp. 64-65.

III

Now, "the use of force is absolutely forbidden to Christians in defence of the Church against persecution; but the use of force is enjoined on the State, and therefore on Christians as members of the State." We must not, like the Pacifist, confuse the two through failing to see what is the nature of the State, for, if we do, "the outside world will dismiss Christianity as an impracticable idealism"; while we ourselves, through our failure to see what the State by its nature is, "will fail to give a clear witness to the fundamental things to which we are called to witness: namely, the sovereignty of God in the affairs of men, and the real existence of a Right and a Wrong, prior to and above the immediate interests of this or that nation" (Hebert).[1] But at the same time it is our duty to use all our influence—and it is not negligible—to secure that such measures and methods of reprisal as the State is obliged to adopt in self-defence shall be retributive and deterrent rather than vindictive. For this purpose it may be convenient to draw a distinction between *reprisals* and *retaliation*, taking the latter to be characterized by the sin of anger, and the former essentially by more impersonal considerations.

Thus, for example, on March 4 of this year there appeared in the *Daily Express* a remarkably cogent and impressive article by Colonel Josiah Wedgwood, D.S.O., M.P., entitled "Why Not Fight Back?", in which he argued that Nazi airmen who attack merchant shipping and are shot down in the North Sea should be left to drown. The editor of the *Daily Express* was careful, however, to dissociate himself and his paper from the views expressed by Colonel Wedgwood in this article. "Consider what his argument really means. The Nazis are murderers: therefore we must become murderers. The Nazis tell lies: therefore we must tell lies. The Nazis torture the weak: therefore we must torture the weak. If we fight the Nazis with their own weapons, what difference is left between the Nazi system and our system? What are we fighting for?" And then, a little inconsequently, he added: "*Recompense to no man evil for evil. Be not overcome of evil, but overcome evil with good.*" The protest was extremely praiseworthy; the more so, seeing that, to judge from the ensuing correspondence, five-sixths

[1] *Grace and Nature*, p. 17.

of his readers took the opposite view. But I cannot help doubting whether the editor had really seen the specifically Christian point. He seemed to be preoccupied with the external action rather than with the underlying motive from which it takes its character. You cannot, I think, lay it down as an absolute rule that, because the Nazi ideology is morally regrettable, therefore you must not fight the Nazis with their own weapons. But you can lay it down as an absolute rule that, whatever weapons you may use, you must not use them in a vindictive spirit. And the real condemnation of Colonel Wedgwood's proposal, as I understand it, is that what it involved, in the last analysis, was not reprisals, but retaliation, in the sense which I have ventured to attribute to these two words.

Take another case. In the spring of 1917, public indignation had been stirred by a succession of what we used to call " German atrocities "—the torpedoing of three liners without warning and with considerable loss of life, the bombing of centres of civilian population in Kent and elsewhere—culminating in the perfectly deliberate sinking of two British hospital ships. As a reprisal for the latter outrage, a large squadron of British and French planes bombed Freiburg on April 14. On May 2, the then Archbishop of Canterbury, Randall Davidson, consistently with the position he had adopted since the beginning of the war, criticized this policy adversely in the House of Lords.[1] His protest is memorable, not only as a corrective to the legend that is so widely prevalent, especially among the young, that in the last war the bishops were principally engaged in making " recruiting speeches "[2] and blessing heavy artillery and generally fanning the flames of patriotic hatred, but also as refuting the common supposition that the Church of England as by law established is always the obsequious handmaid of the State. The Archbishop's attitude evoked widespread indignation: a Scottish Duke desired " the bishops to stick to their belfries, and cobblers to their lasts "; Sir Arthur Conan Doyle contributed a series of eloquent letters on " The Uses of Hatred "; and the Arch-

[1] G. K. A. Bell, *Randall Davidson*, vol. ii, p. 831 *ff.*, and *cf.* p. 757 *ff.*, 777-778.

[2] *Cf.* D. M. Mackinnon in THEOLOGY, May, 1939, p. 381 (" the Archbishop of Canterbury has already made his first recruiting speech "), and a notable rebuke by the Bishop of Coventry (THEOLOGY. November, 1939, p. 373).

bishop, in a private letter to Dr R. F. Horton, described himself as "the recipient of a continuous shower of protests, denunciations, and often violent abuse, from every part of England, especially from London. I am said to be the cause of the Air Raids, to be in league with the Germans, and to be responsible for the death of those who have suffered, and so on. Devout prayers are expressed that I (and occasionally my wife, to whom they sometimes write) may be the next person to be blown to pieces. It is all coupled, strangely enough, with my action in approving a certain amount of agricultural work on Sundays as an emergency measure. . . ."[1]

How far the raid on Freiburg was effective as a deterrent is not wholly clear. It is, however, patent that only the fear of similar reprisals has so far induced the German Air Force to stay their hand from bombing open towns in France and England in the present conflict. In any case, it is, I think, arguable that Archbishop Davidson's protest was mistaken. I can only offer my own view for what it may be worth, but the issue is one that may come up again very soon, and I am certain that we Christians ought to be thinking about it beforehand, and studying our Bibles and praying for Divine guidance, before the spirit of revenge has been awakened, as it had been in 1917 ("particularly," as Sir Hall Caine noted, "among the women of the humbler and less educated classes")[2], clouding the issues and making the task of dispassionate judgment a thousand times more difficult than it is in the present posture of affairs. And it seems to me that both the Archbishop and his opponents were arguing from a false assumption—namely, a confusion between reprisals and retaliation. By the spring of 1917 these had, no doubt, become more difficult to distinguish than they had been at the outbreak of hostilities in 1914. Sir Arthur Conan Doyle invoked "The Uses of Hatred" to justify the raid on Freiburg; Archbishop Davidson accepted his premisses, and rightly condemned them as un-Christian. The real question, which neither of them seems quite to have faced, was whether the raid on Freiburg was ordered and carried out in the spirit of hatred. Was it essentially vindictive? Or was it intended rather to be retributive and deterrent? Remember that our Lord in the Sermon on the Mount lays the whole weight of emphasis on motive.

[1] Bell, *Randall Davidson*, vol. ii, p. 837. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 835.

We have by now, very sensibly, ceased to attempt to delude ourselves into believing that we are not fighting the German people, but only their rulers. Most of us here to-day, I suppose, have friends on the other side, and have not ceased to pray that, if it is God's will, they may be spared. But we have come to recognize that in this war the British people and the British Government are fighting the German people and the German Government, although, so far as I can gauge public opinion, we are doing so in a spirit which, by the mercy of God, is singularly free from hatred, and yet instinct with a grim determination to give back blow for blow, and to hit the enemy back harder than he hits us. That is revenge, in the proper meaning of the word: it is not permissible to the individual Christian, acting upon his own authority, because he has no authority; but does it follow from this that it is not permissible to the State, which has authority from God Himself to bear the sword, and to be an avenger to execute wrath—God's wrath—upon him that doeth evil?

It is indeed a painful thought that, in the circumstances of the case, such vengeance cannot always be so limited as to fall only upon the guilty, without involving also those Germans who are opposed to the régime, and women and babies. We must, of course, preserve a sense of proportion, which Mr Bernard Shaw conspicuously failed to do in *Geneva*; as Miss Rose Macaulay gently reminded us in her essay on "Catchwords and Claptrap," "In point of fact, the number of British infants slain by enemy bombs during the war was extremely small, but one might have gathered from the press that they formed the majority of slain non-combatants."[1] Nevertheless, it is disquieting to remember that war has always unavoidably, in some degree, involved treating the innocent as accessories after the fact: and this is one of the major reasons for constantly endeavouring, in our policy, to seek peace and ensue it, though not at the expense of righteousness and truth and justice. And yet we know that it is in the nature of God's universe that the sins of the fathers are visited upon their children; and that, although God's justice can never be perfectly vindicated until the Last Assize, yet to the power ordained of God, the State, is entrusted, as a solemn duty, the rough vindication of His justice in the ordering of the world, and such rough vindication of God's justice is not to be refused

[1] Hogarth Essays, 2nd Series (1926), p. 25.

because it is of necessity imperfect. That must be said, since the Christian religion is realist, and not romantic: but God forbid that we should say it in any spirit of complacency.

IV

The issues involved are indeed difficult and complicated, but for that very reason it is of the first importance that we as Christians should not shirk them. However we may be guided to resolve them, it seems to me that there are two considerations which must never be lost sight of, whatever happens. The first is that we must not confuse what is forbidden to Christians as members of the Church with what is enjoined upon them as members of the State. We are not fighting for Christianity, because Christianity forbids us to do so. Nor do I think that we are fighting for Christian civilization, because I do not think that modern European civilization is particularly recognizable under that description. But we are fighting for something that is thoroughly worth fighting for, and that thing is European civilization, even with all its superficial imperfections. We are fighting for the law which Rome made, and for the liberty of the Greek citizen, and for the freedom of intellectual speculation and inquiry which is our heritage from the Renaissance and the Reformation. We are fighting for those fundamental liberties without which civilization is impossible: freedom of thought, freedom of speech, freedom of association, freedom of worship. We are not fighting for our religion, but we are fighting for something that our religion recognizes to be worth fighting for.

And the second consideration is our Lord's emphasis on *motive*. War is a messy business, and we are all involved in it whether we like it or not, from the combatant down to the conscientious objector. From a Labour Research Department pamphlet entitled *Who's Who in Arms* (1935) you will discover that the late Canon H. R. L. Sheppard himself owned shares in a company which happened also to manufacture armaments;[1] and economic laws obliged the Americans to sell munitions to Russia for use against the Finns. We are all in it, and war is a messy business, especially total war: and we can hardly hope to come out of it with clean hands. But God grant that we may come out of it with clean hearts.

CHARLES SMYTH.

[1] *Who's Who in Arms*, p. 43.

Christianity and Poetry

I

The men of the Middle Ages or of the Reformation would hardly have been able to grasp the question: Why be a Christian? They lived in a society where everybody was officially Christian, and the problem of deciding for or against Christianity did not arise. The thirteenth-century Emperor of Germany, Frederick II, who declared that mankind had been deceived by three impostors—Jesus Christ, Moses and Mohammed—was simply an exception. Even the more daring spirits of the Renaissance had their qualms about unbelief: Faustus, in Marlowe's play, after dedicating himself to a boundless paganism, expired in an agony of Christian remorse; and even the swashbuckling Benvenuto Cellini, who cared for neither the law of God nor man, was consoled in prison by visions of the Blessed Virgin. The Reformation did not change matters much; one had still to adopt the type of reformed religion to which the State adhered, or emigrate. But for the last century or so we have been living in societies which have had no State religion; and even before the last World War almost fifty per cent. of the population in Western Europe and the United States had ceased to belong in any real sense to the Church. Unbelief became for the first time socially respectable. The dream of Frederick the Great of Prussia had come true: *Jeder soll nach seiner façon selig werden.*

In the most recent period a still further development has occurred. Non-Christians have swung from agnosticism to passionate allegiance to what are in effect new religions: Communism, Fascism, Nazism. The older sceptics had rejected Christianity rather wistfully, at times with a sense of painful frustration. Thomas Huxley would have given his right hand to have been able to share the faith of Gladstone; Hardy wrote of Christmas with a poignant regret:

> "If someone said on Christmas Eve,
> 'Come see the oxen kneel,
> In the lonely barton by yonder coomb
> Our childhood used to know,'
> I should go with him in the gloom,
> Hoping it might be so."

That mood has passed. The new totalitarian philosophies have produced working substitutes for Christian devotion. So much is clear from Father Harris's remarkable volume, *Unholy Pilgrimage*: "As the Church once claimed to be a new creation with a New Man, so might the Soviet Union claim to be a new creation with its New Man." And the same note is heard in the writings of the German pagans, such as Wilhelm Hauer: "We believe that a real difference exists between the older pioneers for a Teutonized Christianity and the youth of to-day. The former still need, or imagine they need, Jesus in some form or other. The latter are not deeply moved by Him."

To-day, then, we are forced to ask ourselves the question: Why be a Christian? For we are faced not only with unbelief but with other-belief. We must ask ourselves whether it is worth while to affirm the paradoxes of a religion based on reason *and* faith, nature *and* supernature.

II

The older apologetic for Christianity rested on the belief that other interpretations of existence were fundamentally false, perhaps even temptations of the devil, while the Christian view of life had a clear title to acceptance. The missionary scorned the native beliefs of the Buddhist or Mohammedan, and hoped to convince the heathen by giving him a Bible with the central message of salvation specially printed in red ink. That approach has been abandoned because it has been recognized that the non-Christian positions have a great deal of truth in them, and that Christianity has within it paradoxes that are hard to accept. Other views are not simply wrong and the Christian view obviously right. One does not reject atheism or paganism because there is nothing to be said for them, but because theism is at once more tenable and more adequate.

We ought to be ready to admit that our neighbours who are not Christians are often more intelligent and better people than we are. Very often they have rejected our beliefs because they have seen weaknesses in our formulations which have not been obvious to us. Or they may have been repelled by the injustices which Christians have condoned in defiance of their alleged principles. These two facts explain, it is realized, the apathy of the academic

and the working classes. Christianity has too often been what its opponents have called it—the crucifixion of the intellect and the opiate of the people. Non-Christians have a great deal to say which it would be wise for us to listen to; we have no cause to look down on them as beings who could see the light if they only would. To answer positively the question, " Why be a Christian ?" does not involve a wholesale condemnation of other interpretations of life.

It could not, for Christianity has much in common with other forms of belief. We believe in God, that Nature has meaning and purposiveness; so do many philosophers and artists who do not adhere to the Church. Indeed, were it not for the rational convictions that I share with those outside the Church, I would not myself dare to enter upon the specific way of Christian faith. There are, of course, those who attempt, as Dr Horton has so well put it, " to confine God's self-revelation to one lurid, overwhelming flash of lightning, which does not even illuminate the surrounding landscape, but strikes the believer blind and dumb, unable to articulate his faith except in negatives." But few are likely to find illumination in Jesus' deeds and words if He stands absolutely over against all other life. If all experience, reason and emotion told us that life was a sordid mess, and only Christ through Church and Bible assured us that there was a silver lining to the cloud, I for one would be dreadfully suspicious of the credibility of the revelation. It is because Jesus adds a wider and higher meaning to an existence already meaningful that we can see Him to be the special revelation of God.

I desire then to be a Christian, paradoxically enough, because I can find God partly at least without Christ by immersing myself in the beauty, goodness and high tragedy of this life of ours. In the profound satisfactions of human love and affection—of parent and child, friend and friend, husband and wife—physical proximity becomes the vehicle of spiritual nearness, and in an ecstasy of self-giving and mutual care two souls become almost one. In working for the betterment of mankind our social self is satisfyingly integrated with the life process. Others of us find a revelation of the meaning of life in the beauty of the natural world, though often less and less as the years go by and the senses become less acute, less subject to " those obstinate questionings of sense and outward things, fallings from

us, vanishings." Sometimes the revelation comes through art and music. But for myself the chief vehicle of this kind of experience is poetry, creative literature, and the wonder of words. The effect of seeing Komisarjewski's production of *King Lear* I can describe only as a religious experience. Lear was shown by Shakespeare and his interpreters as having, in Aristotelian phrase, fulfilled his function as a man in a full and complete life. But it does not take a whole tragedy to produce such an effect; a mere phrase may lift one into a world where life appears to be not chance and disaster, but a thing of exceeding great glory and the very garment of God.

The essence of the poetic vision is bound up particularly with the poet's use of metaphor and simile, by which he discovers analogies which are felt in the depths of our psycho-physical being, between the processes of nature and the realm of value. Some metaphors have a strictly intellectual quality; the analogy is perceived chiefly by the mind. It was this sort of metaphor which appealed to the critical mind of Aristotle and the " metaphysical " poet Donne. But perhaps the deepest metaphors and similes are not based on the sort of scientific resemblance between two things seen in the lines

> " The hair that lay along her back
> Was yellow like ripe corn."

The likeness has a sort of objectivity; it could be made only in the case of a blonde. But when Burns writes

> " O my Luve's like a red, red rose "

he does not imply that the lady has rosy cheeks, but rather that there is something about both the red rose and the beloved that make him feel the same way. The analogy must be experienced, not simply grasped by the mind. Either type of metaphor is, however, congenial to a great poet.

And what of the significance of the poetry of Shakespeare? Does his use of metaphor recompense us for the absence of any express " philosophy " in the plays? If Mr Middleton Murry and Miss Caroline Spurgeon are right, as I believe they are, it is precisely in the imagery which he uses that Shakespeare's deepest intuitions are to be found. Mr Murry's *Keats and Shakespeare* and his later *Shakespeare*, and Miss Spurgeon's *Shakespeare's Imagery*, when read in the light

of each other, definitely bring the poet within the sphere of a high natural religion. It would be strange if it were otherwise if, as I have argued, poetry is the supreme vehicle in the natural realm for communicating the sense of a link between fact and value.

III

It is, however, the supernatural character of the revelation in Christ that is at once its supreme claim on our interest and the chief cause of those paradoxes which make it at the same time so difficult for many to accept. At first one is struck by the terrific gulf between nature and supernature: one notices at what awful cost Christ lived the life of the hidden love of God; how much that is normal or human He had to surrender in order to be what He was. But He is Christ and we are Christians. He came to apply to mankind the final mystery and treasure of the love of God, and to do so He had to surrender the world and its allegiances. But we have to continue to live in the world. Our life must therefore remain more natural than His.

In the inexpressibly painful days since the outbreak of the new World War, when the ethical realization of the divine Kingdom seems more distant than ever before, perhaps it may bring some solace to think of two ways in which the poetic genius serves as a continuing link between the natural and the supernatural worlds.

First, in an understanding of the Gospel; for it was by simile and metaphor that the historic Christ communicated His truth to man. Now that modern scholarship has shown that the parables are not tedious allegories, but living similitudes drawn from real life, we can see their wonder as never before. It was the ordinary life of first-century Galilee, sowing and reaping, death and birth and marriage, commerce and government, which yielded to the mind and heart of Christ those pregnant analogies of the Kingdom. To redeem man, Christ had to be a poet.

Then, secondly, because of the analogy between things natural and supernatural, because of the poetic character of reality, Christ was able to bring sacramental worship to His people. More than once during the course of His ministry Christ took ordinary food and drink—bread, wine, fish (basic nourishment of the common folk)—and used them as effective symbols of the Divine Reality which

was drawing near in Him, the Kingdom come and to come. Once again the natural and the supernatural meet: as the one is presented to our bodies, the other is presented to our inmost being; and at the same time, under the same symbols, all natural life is again offered to its supernatural Lord. And at a time when it seems almost impossible to do the pure will of God in the realm of action, when at most we are offered a choice between two evils, this link of the divine and the human in worship is more and more precious.

In our hearts, then, we have two certainties, both of them bound up with the meaning of poetry at its deepest. All life is suffused with a strange and tragic beauty which is the impress of a divine creative spirit; and that same spirit in Christ has shown us, again by poetic symbol, the triumph and glory of suffering, redemptive love. It is the poetry of nature and the poetry of supernature which give us faith in the promise that " the sufferings of this present time are not worthy to be compared with the glory that shall be revealed in us."

T. S. K. Scott-Craig.

The Sunday Offices and the War

Those who use the Quarterly Intercession Paper for Missions were reminded each Sunday during the first quarter of this year of some important words of the Archbishop of York:

" In time of war a primary duty of Christians is to maintain their fellowship across all national divisions. Especially should they be united in their prayers, and avoid ' praying against each other.' Christian prayer is not an attempt to use God for our purposes, but a petition that He will use us for His."

A similar thought will have been the inspiration of those who observed the octave of prayer in January for the reunion of Christendom. It can hardly be denied, however, that this wide outlook is shared by only a minority of the Christian family. Intelligent laypeople are perplexed to know how best to encourage the spread of this ecumenism. They perhaps recommend the admirable *Christian News-Letter*, edited by Dr J. H. Oldham, to their friends, and

seek to prepare to meet the dangers of a new nationalism. Priests do their part by careful choice of biddings and intercessions, as well as by direct teaching in sermons. But there is a need for something more, if the Church is to deliver its saving message adequately to the disordered world. In brief, the Church must become aware of her own nature, and seek to express it in her worship.

This is the purpose of what is known as the " Liturgical Movement," with which readers of THEOLOGY are familiar from the numerous articles that have appeared on the subject. It is the object of the present essay to draw attention to the " liturgical " possibilities of Matins and Evensong, which are at present unduly neglected in favour of the Eucharist, and in particular to suggest a new approach to the offices. The time is ripe for a serious attempt, as Mr Warren put it in the issue of October, 1939, at " possessing our possessions," making the best use of the splendid liturgical heritage which is ours. We are not doing this at present. With the best intentions in the world priests abridge or alter the appointed order, thus defeating the purpose of the set office, and the laity, even when due order is observed, from sheer lack of teaching fail to enter as fully as they should into the full significance of the sacred offering.

Liturgical worship is an art which needs to be learnt. This does not mean that it is unnatural, any more than the cultivation of musical taste means that music is unnatural. On the contrary, man has been created in order that in the mystical body of Christ he may find his eternal bliss in common worship of Almighty God. The Church on earth seeks to anticipate this blessedness: in her ordered worship she gives the earnest of our inheritance, preparing man for the full fruition hereafter. Common prayer thus corresponds to the deepest need of man's nature, whether he realizes it or not. But it is an art to be learnt, and the learning of it does not come easily to a society enfeebled by undue individualism. It is more congenial to pray one's own prayers than to pray with the Church. But prayer except as a member of the Church is not prayer in Christ's name, and, lacking its true centre, it becomes eccentric. People abandon the habit of praying chiefly because they pray unsuccessfully in the wrong way. Liturgical worship is a school for beginners as well as a delight for the experts, because it aims at reproducing, however inadequately, the prayer of Jesus Christ.

Here is the first essential truth. In the offices (and in the Eucharist too, though we are not now concerned with that) the Church on earth seeks to join with her great High Priest and with the Church in heaven in their unceasing offering. Jesus knows all, loves all and prays for all; the blessed saints are united to Him by the closest bonds, and praise with Him and in Him. "The holy Church throughout all the world," militant still, praises and prays with the other members of the mystical Body. What she says and sings is not a mere congeries of man-made devotions: she speaks with the voice of her Lord. Would you know the mind of Christ? Join the Church at prayer and enter into the treasures of the Psalter. Calvin called it "an anatomy of all the parts of the human soul," and Prothero "the whole music of the heart of man, swept by the hand of his maker"; hence no book can better express the thoughts of Him who is perfect man. Speaking now in His own Person and in the name of those made perfect ("I love Thy commandments above gold and precious stone"), now in the name of the as yet militant and sin-laden Church on earth ("Turn thy face from my sins: and put out all my misdeeds"), Christ leads the symphony of redeemed humanity.[1] Between the Head and the members exists a wonderful accord and unanimity: love is the life-blood of the body.

It follows that there is a certain timelessness about liturgical worship; the worshipper does not necessarily find his own mood reflected in the appointed Psalm. He may be the proud possessor of an infant son, but the Church calls on him to sing the De Profundis. He may be suffering the agony of sudden bereavement, and find her rejoicing with the Jubilate. But worship lifts him above and outside himself; he leaves his joys and sorrows behind (and national joys and sorrows behind, too) when he joins in the Church's offering, but it is only to find them

[1] Those who imagine that such mystical interpretation is beyond the capacity of the average worshipper might well pause to reflect on the popularity of Blake's "Jerusalem." What, it could be asked, is the use of inquiring whether Jesus Christ ever visited Somerset, when the answer is obviously, No, and why should the man of to-day ask for a variety of obsolete and unsuitable weapons to be provided in order that he might erect the capital city of Palestine in England? Without mystical interpretation the poem is absurd. And what does the "man in the street" make of a hymn like Songs of Praise, no. 315, an extract from O'Shaughnessy's "Music-makers"?

again, purged of the merely selfish and individual, in the great context of God's loving purposes. The individual's contrition may be very defective, his love timid and faltering, but the Body makes up these deficiencies: what else is the reconciliation Christ has won? United with Christ, he will learn contrition and love, he will grow in spiritual stature with his brethren until it is no longer he that lives, but Christ liveth in him. In corporate worship the individual is taken out of himself and his passing moods, and made to share, to some extent at least, in the perfect life of Christ, and in the experience of all humanity. He is enabled to see life steadily and see it whole, and thus return to his ordinary existence inspired and strengthened by the vision.

The Lessons similarly are an opportunity for meditation on God and the great things that He has done. In the Old Testament is shown God creating, God selecting a people to whom He might progressively reveal Himself, God delivering them from Egypt, God making a covenant with them, God guiding the nation through its vicissitudes, purging, punishing, restoring. In the New Testament the purpose of it all becomes crystal clear: Jesus has come to (re-) build the Church of God that was lying in ruins, and in Him God is seen redeeming His people by the Passion and Death, and gathering souls into the mystical Body of Christ through apostles and evangelists. Thus as the year goes by the Christian is given an insight into the age-long and world-wide purpose of God, and so becomes aware of the dignity of his place in the wondrous scheme of redemption. The careful choice of Sunday lessons provided brings him near to his spiritual ancestors, and instead of being merely dismayed, for example, on the first Sunday evening in Lent by the story of Hagar's expulsion, he will see in it the type of unbelieving Israel's rejection, and the need for drastic measures in his own life during the penitential season. So enlightened he prays in the Collect for the effectual subduing of the flesh to the Spirit.

Much of the criticism of the Revised Lectionary is off the mark from failure to approach it in the right way. The desire to avoid anything in the way of obscurity or length indicates an unduly man-centred approach: as if God's will were not difficult for sin-blinded minds to grasp, and disconcerting when grasped! Lessons are "too short" or "too long"; it may be that some adjustment is desirable,

but we should take care before rationing God's Word to a world that is dying for it. We of this generation need good measure of the Bible, pressed down and running over, in our services, not a few snippets which will serve to introduce the sermon. It is true that God's judgments as declared in the Scriptures hit hard and unexpectedly: like Balak, we may be dismayed at the result of seeking supernatural help. But that it is salutary, salvation-bearing, we cannot doubt. It may even appear tedious, "precept upon precept, precept upon precept, line upon line, line upon line," and yet be true and life-giving.

If the Christian will but enter thus deeply into the significance of the daily offices, apart from the consequent enrichment of his spiritual life, he will be well armed against the false prophets of to-day, who are none the less false because they are in possession of part of the truth. He will know better than to declare that the Prayer Book affirms that God is fighting for us as English people; he will have learnt that the "we" for whom God fights is His Church, and that the nation can only ask penitently to be shown how to fight on God's side. He will not regard the "enemies" of whom the Psalms speak as the Germans or the Italians, but as the evil self which exists in *every* man. There will be no national or denominational barriers in his outlook, for he is conscious of belonging to the Catholic Church, which transcends both. The inner life of the mystical body will be the most vivid and precious reality to him, saving him from the individualism of the national temperament. He will be a Christian first, and an Englishman second.

Let this become a reality in the lives of the clergy and they will pass it on unconsciously to their congregations. But let there also be courses of instruction on the offices, the Psalter, the Lessons, the Collects, the Liturgical Year. It is the writer's experience that people are pathetically grateful for such help, and welcome it in the depths of the country as well as in the town. A sermon which draws out the import of Psalms, Lessons and Collect is of the greatest value, though it should precede rather than follow the office. This is practicable sometimes, but what seems to be needed is a "Companion to the Offices," which, prefaced by a brief rationale of the offices, will on the basis of the Psalms and Lessons of the Revised Lectionary and the Collects draw out the leading thoughts in the office. This has often been done profitably with the variable parts of

the Holy Communion, but never with the Sunday offices. A close study of Evensong for Sundays and Holy Days throughout the year has shown that in almost every case some consecutive line of thought can be isolated, even allowing for the alternative lections provided. Doubtless the same is true of Matins. Armed with such a brief commentary, either in the form of a book or of loose sheets for each Sunday in the year, the congregation would be helped to an intelligent participation in the offices: Sunday by Sunday the Church's intention in using the Psalter and Bible would become clear, with a consequent deepening and strengthening of devotion.

A suggested commentary on Evensong of Trinity X is appended, and illustrates the kind of thing required. This particular Sunday has been chosen, because it is not specially amenable, as are the Sundays before Trinity, and because the Revised Lectionary has recently been criticized with these Lessons as an example of awkwardness and undue length. The Lessons are certainly long, but they are far from being unsatisfactory.

TRINITY X

Prayer is the chief theme in the Church's worship to-night. The penitential *Psalm* li is sung to remind us that for sinful man penitence is necessary before our worship of God can start. By confessing our sins, as we do at the beginning of Evensong, we show that we know the truth about ourselves. The Church has followed the psalmist in first making confession of sin, and then appealing to God: " Thou shalt open my lips, O Lord: and my mouth shall shew thy praise " (15). *Psalm* liv is a typical prayer for deliverance by the Church. Her prayers are always acceptable to God because they are the prayers of her Head, Jesus Christ. Hence the thanksgiving that the prayer is heard, in verse 7.

First Lesson

A.—1 Kings xxii, 1-40: When we want something in prayer very badly, we are inclined to behave like Ahab. He listened to the four hundred prophets saying to him, " Go up, and prosper," because that was what he wanted to do. But he had a lingering feeling that his plans were not God's: even before he asked the advice of the true prophet Micaiah, he knew what the answer would be. But he went on with his plan all the same, and the battle ended in his death. In prayer we often pray for what *we* want, with the knowledge deep down in us that it is not what God wants. Let us learn to say, " Thy will be done," not mine.

B.—2 Kings iv, 8-37: God's ears are always open to His people's prayers, as His prophet's were to the petition of the lady of Shunem. So when Elisha prayed God to raise the dead boy to life, his prayer was heard.

C.—Ecclesiasticus xi, 7-28: A selection of the ripest wisdom of the pre-Christian world. Notice especially verses 11 and 12, which illustrate the difference between the man who prays and the man who does not. The latter "laboureth, and taketh pains, and maketh haste, and is so much the more behind," because he is out of tune with God. The former may be "slow . . . and full of poverty," but because he waits upon the will of God in prayer, he prospers in the end.

Second Lesson

A.—Matthew xiii, 24-52: If our prayer is to be effective, our wills must be submitted to God's will, so that we may pray, "Thy kingdom come." So that we may get a vision of the Kingdom, we listen to a variety of our Lord's parables about the Kingdom, and learn that we must use every faculty to be its inheritors (44-46).

B.—Acts xxvii: The story of St Paul's shipwreck contains a fine illustration of prayer in the midst of danger. With the confidence of one who has put himself entirely into the hands of God, St Paul is able to declare God's will and purposes to the sailors. In times of difficulty the man who is in closest touch with God is the safest guide.

"O Lord, save thy people.
And bless thine inheritance."

The Collect summarizes exactly our thoughts and aspirations: "Let thy merciful ears, O Lord, be open to the prayers of thy humble servants: and that they may obtain their petitions, make them to ask such things as shall please thee."

Kenneth N. Ross.

The Journals of Søren Kierkegaard[1]

E. C. Hoskyns, in his *Cambridge Sermons*, edited by Charles Smyth, begins his study of eschatology with an anecdote which I cannot forbear quoting. "There is a village in the fell country of Westmorland, not far from Shap, which lies remote from the haunts of the ordinary tourist. Had you visited it during the summer on a Sunday you would have found almost the whole population, male and female,

[1] Edited and translated by Alexander Dru (Oxford University Press, 25s.).

crowding the church for the morning service—a not altogether usual sight in modern England. Curiosity, if not religious duty, might perhaps have prompted you to desire to discover what had thus moved the village people, and to enter yourself in order to satisfy your curiosity. At first there would have appeared nothing strange—just an ordinary church, just the ordinary morning service, and the quite ordinary Westmorland music. Only when the vicar commenced his sermon was the secret of the hardly suppressed excitement betrayed. With passionate conviction he declared the end of the present order to be imminent. Civilization was tottering on the brink of destruction. No intelligent reform could save it, no social reform could postpone the disaster. The world as it is is doomed, and Armageddon is at hand. The Lord is about to appear in His wrath as the Judge, and only those who are His will pass through the terror unscathed." It was my good fortune to be born and bred in one of the Westmorland valleys where a tradition of stern but wholesome piety still permeated the whole of life. True, the more violent impact of such teaching as Hoskyns describes reached us through the medium of little groups of Dissenters rather than through the ministers of the Established Church. But the challenge was always there, had been there for generations. The great day of the Lord was an imminent possibility, nor were the Lord's chosen messengers daunted by the knowledge that their fathers had taught the same Evangel and had died without seeing the consummation of all things. I suppose that early impressions dominate one's adult life much more than one is always conscious of; at any rate, the writings of Kierkegaard, when I first met them some years ago in French translation, immediately exercised an immense power over me. Catholic thought would still be found a little strange in our Westmorland dales, though its serener message of the Incarnate God has been inculcated to some extent for three hundred years by a body of people for whom the dales have a natural respect —I mean the Quakers. The Church of England on the whole has in these parts held the balance between the two varieties of religious experience. Yet each has been powerful, and I for one can read William Law's dialogues with pleasure, and I trust profit, whilst at the same time realizing how strong is the fascination of Kierkegaard or Barth. I make these personal observations with diffidence, because

to many readers of THEOLOGY Kierkegaard will already have long been familiar; yet, it is true to say that there are churchmen to whom such works as *Fear and Trembling* or the *Journals* even have, apparently, very little to offer, and I can only explain my own admiration, therefore, in terms of environment.

Most readers of THEOLOGY have read some at least of the recent books on Kierkegaard available in English, but I may be allowed perhaps to mention a few of the best. The Oxford University Press has published several of Kierkegaard's own works—*Fear and Trembling*, the *Journals*, *Purify your Hearts*—and has at least under preparation several more. The same publishers are responsible for what is the best full-length life of Kierkegaard available (I mean that by Dr Walter Lowrie) and what is equally the most authoritative short study (that by Theodor Haecker, translated by Alexander Dru). Alexander Dru is also responsible for this splendid edition of the *Journals*. I do not myself read Danish, but I understand that Kierkegaard (who incidentally despised the vernacular, though he adorned it!) is fiendishly difficult to translate. There are occasional passages in this edition that are not easily susceptible of paraphrase, but on the whole the book reads easily and there are many memorable epigrams which bear testimony to the skill of the translator.

Journals are of necessity of two kinds: the private, essentially personal, and those written with an eye to future publication. These *Journals*, which cover the years 1834 to 1854, are a mixture of both. The first part (roughly from 1834 to 1846) consists of intensely personal statements and a good deal of experimental writing. The second part, which deals with the last ten years of his life, is a much more artistic whole, being thought of as a final statement to the world of his relations with God and man. In 1849 he writes, significantly enough: "Should my Journals be published after my death it might be done under the title *The Book of the Judge*." Mr Dru says of this: "The 'Judge' is the furthest limit to which he pushed the definition of his genius. 'I am even tempted,' he wrote in *Fear and Trembling*, 'to call myself *tortor heroum*, for I am very ingenious in putting heroes to the torture.' In the *Journals* his ingenuity can be followed as it led him slowly and inevitably to the final attack on official Christianity. It is first directed against Hegel, but in turn all the 'heroes'

are put to torture in order to extract the truth: Luther, Socrates, Schopenhauer, Epictetus, ancients and moderns, man and woman, and not least himself—and all this with the wit and savagery of Swift." Kierkegaard's humour is so often ignored by even his warmest admirers that I venture to give a specimen of this caustic raillery:

THE DIALECTIC OF BEGINNING

Scene in the Underworld

Characters : Socrates, Hegel.

Socrates *sits by a rippling stream, in the cool, listening to the sound of the water.* Hegel *is sitting at a table reading Trendelenburg's "Logische Untersuchungen," Part II, page* 198, *and goes across to* Socrates *in order to complain.*

Socrates: Shall we begin by being in complete disagreement, or in agreement upon something which we will call an assumption?

Hegel: . . . . . .

Socrates: With what assumptions do you begin?

Hegel: From none at all.

Socrates: That is quite possible; perhaps you do not begin at all.

Hegel: I not begin, I who have written twenty-one volumes?

Socrates: Ye Gods! what a hecatomb you have sacrificed.

Hegel: But I begin from nothing.

Socrates: Is not that from anything?

Hegel: No, the inverse process. It is only understood at the end of the whole work, in which I have dealt with all sciences, the whole of universal history, etc. . . .

Socrates: How shall I ever get over that difficulty? for many curious things must certainly have happened which would charm me. (A misuse of oratorical statement.) And you know that I never let even Polos talk for more than five minutes, and you want to talk twenty-one volumes.

But the *Journals* are seasoned with such liveliness from beginning to end, and this engaging wit serves to make more poignant the reflections on human suffering which are its chief topic. Kierkegaard, in a modified sense of the word, is a Romantic, but his genius is so original that it is difficult to attach labels to it, and although he is a Romantic and, as he himself acknowledges, belongs to a Romantic phase of history, there is a certain toughness about his thought which makes him in some ways a very different figure from S. T. Coleridge, say, though both had great

intellectual gifts and acute sensibility. The Romantic element in the *Journals* appears as a slightly *passé* egotism—an egotism which carries with it all the typically Romantic *Weltschmertz* and " atmosphere " of the unhappy lover. This is, to my mind, a blemish in his work, but it should not be confused with the deeply sincere and profoundly valuable observations on the mental crisis which occurred when he broke off his engagement to Regine Ollsen.

Before passing on to this deeper aspect of his work I would like to draw attention to his interest in the music of Mozart, for it serves to unify the rather self-conscious Romanticism with the profounder feeling. Thus *Don Juan* and the sensuous love music of Mozart correspond to the Romantic side of his nature, and he indeed frequently relates his life to such aspects of Mozart's genius; but the greater Mozart, and the kind of pathos that there is in the greatest Mozart, is not strictly speaking Romantic. And that is the subtle distinction between the superficial melancholia of Kierkegaard and the suffering Kierkegaard who has gained a vision of humanity in terms of divine compassion.

We approach now the central core of the *Journals* as I see them: the observations on human life, and, of course, in a special way on his own life, of a man living consciously on the verge of eternity—that is, living eschatologically. To avoid forcing my own opinions somewhat arbitrarily at this point I will venture to give the considered opinion of Dr Lowrie on this subject. " It is perfectly true," he says, " that S. K. had no interest in the fantastic apocalyptic imagery which is prominent in the Gospels, but was already a vanishing element there, and is only a particular embellishment of eschatology. But it cannot be denied that S. K. had a vivid sense of ' the hereafter ' (*hisset*) as opposed to the ' here,' of the impending judgment of the last day, of the resurrection of the dead, ' both of the just and of . . . the unjust,' and that in this light (that is, in the light of other-worldliness) he understood the beatitudes of the Gospels and the requirements of discipleship. But this is the essence of Christian eschatology. Even the ' thoroughgoing eschatology ' with which Albert Schweitzer has made us familiar was in some singular respects anticipated by S. K. In spite of his reliance upon the report of the Fourth Gospel that Christ openly proclaimed Himself to be God, S. K. understood that in the days of His flesh He was

completely unrecognizable as God and preserved 'the strictest incognito.' And the whole period, however long it may be, which extends from Christ's earthly life to His return in glory, he regarded as a 'parenthesis,' a time of testing for man, which prescribes a sort of behaviour (Schweitzer's 'interim ethics') which cannot be simply deduced by common sense from the conditions in which we find ourselves in this world."

It is in this setting that one must read such an entry as the following made in 1850, five years only before his death: "Christianity is as good as done away with. But first a poet's heart must break, or a poet must be torn in two in such a way as to close the way to all deceptions. That is the check; and in our limited sphere that is my task." Because the "hereafter" of the impending judgment of the last day was so vivid to him, because eternity (which implies that final judgment) also impinges on ordinary, prosaic workaday life in a terrifying way to those who are conscious of it, Kierkegaard lived at a state of tension which most of us can only dimly appreciate. He was conscious that he was a sinner. He believed in God passionately, devotedly, but he was baffled by the apparent inconsistencies of God's dealings with humanity. As the tension increases he comes more and more to believe in what he called "a teleological suspension of the ethical." He formulated this theory in the "Postscript," and it is a theory which may commend itself as attractive to many people to-day.[1]

We live in a world of relative ends, he claims, and we cannot ignore the relative purposes which are essential to our ordinary normal existence. But besides this there is the absolute telos, "the expectation of an eternal blessedness," pure, holy and apart, and which has nothing to do with the so-called world of normality. The great problem for each of us is either to adjust these claims to some sort of *modus vivendi* or else somehow to devote ourselves wholly to the greater claim—and it is just at that point, Kierkegaard insists, that most individual Christians and formal, organized

[1] This is a dangerous theory if misunderstood. Kierkegaard wishes, I take it, to emphasize the priority of God's claims on the individual, claims which in certain circumstances may mean our undertaking, as an act of faith, measures that seem to cut across all our normal loyalties. It seems to me to be an answer to Pacifism. But I can see that it might equally be used by Pacifists against those of us who feel we must participate in the present struggle.

Christianity begin to reveal their duplicity. The only way for the man who is living eschatologically is to wean himself little by little from relative ends, and this means suffering—Christian suffering as opposed to, let us say, Romantic despair. I can perhaps best illustrate the distinction I mean by a brief consideration of a passage from Pascal, a writer whom Kierkegaard in many ways resembles. Pascal writes: " Jesus souffre dans sa passion les tourments que lui font les hommes; mais dans l'agonie il souffre les tourments qu'il se donne à lui-même." The romantic poet would no doubt associate himself with the first part of this, but it is the " qu'il se donne à lui-même " that will escape him. This kind of paradox is what Kierkegaard would mean by the term *Forargelse*—that is, a " stumbling-block," a temptation in the sense of trial which might deter one from faith. Hence the following passage, " the effect which the idea of God demands of us is to have to understand that suffering must not only be borne, but that it is good, a gift of the God of love." " Take this case !" he says, " when a man causes another man suffering and wishing to be cruel adds: ' this is cruelty '—that is some relief. But if, when he causes pain he says: ' this is kindness '—that is enough to send one mad, humanly speaking." And this, I think, explains the following very characteristic meditation on the problem of St Peter's denial. " If Christ had been merely a man, then Peter would clearly not have denied Him; Peter was too deep and honest for that. But whereas in general the parsons talk nonsense in the opposite sense and say that it was doubly irresponsible of Peter because Christ was God, one ought to say: No, that is precisely what explains Peter. Had he simply looked upon Christ as a man, then he could well have endured the thought that He should be treated thus, and Peter would not have forgotten himself but would have been true to Him. But the seeming madness that Christ was God, that He had it in His power to call legions of angels at any moment He wished: that is what utterly overwhelmed Peter. Just as one can lose the power of speech from fright, in the same way all Peter's ideas left him, and in that, as it were, apoplectic condition he denied Him."

It is in some such way that many of us must have watched the present tragedy of war sweep over Europe, in spite of all the prayers and genuine desires for righteousness and peace that existed to combat it. We should do well to

remember Kierkegaard's parable told in *Fear and Trembling* of the bewilderment of Abraham called upon, so it seemed, by God to destroy the hope of a spiritual nation as personified by Isaac. Yet in the ultimate moment of despair God catastrophically reveals his love and the hope of Abraham is not confounded. Is it wrong for us, I wonder, to believe that sacrifice still effects redemption?

One final comment on these *Journals* about which there is much more to say than a mere layman can ever hope to do, and this of the breaking off of his engagement. A great deal has been written about this subject and the psychologists have had a very good innings, the latest theory being, one gathers, that Kierkegaard had some sort of fixation centred on the imposing character of his father—a father whom he loved blindly, but whom he found to his horror was a man of much weaker character than he had dared believe. Because of this fixation, say the psychologists, Kierkegaard was incapable of heterosexual love. Other writers have advanced other theories, Mr Philip Mairet in the December, 1939, issue of *Purpose* saying, for instance: "We who look at the whole episode objectively can say that Kierkegaard backed out of his engagement simply because he was neurotic." I should most strongly dispute this judgment. I think it is clear that Kierkegaard, living in a state of high religious tension, "living eschatologically," in fact, broke off the engagement because it seemed to him to be God's will. In any case, the attitude of awe and deep spiritual searching which he brought to bear on the question of his marriage is not, I think, among sensitive men so very unusual. In its more normal form it has been perfectly expressed by the clerical poet Jean Bertaut, who was one of the successors of the Pléiade school of poetry in the late sixteenth century:

> "La crainte de perdre une chose si chère
> Fait que je ne sens point l'heur de la posséder."

Or as Kierkegaard with great beauty and dignity himself says, "A real love-affair always grips a person so profoundly that he is brought into the ethical sphere." One cannot lightly dismiss such a claim: Kierkegaard was a man of integrity.

JOHN SHORT.

MISCELLANEA

IMPORTANT NOTICE

American subscribers are informed that we are no longer allowed to give credit for "Theology." Subscriptions must be pre-paid, and in dollar currency. Our agents, The Macmillan Company, have made suitable arrangements, and no difficulty will be experienced by those ordering through them.

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

The article entitled "Baptismal Disgrace" is based on a sermon preached before the University of Cambridge on Sunday, June 2.

The Rev. J. F. W. Boden-Worsley is the Rector of North Wingfield, Derbyshire, and author of *Mischiefs of the Marriage Law*.

The Rev. Charles Smyth is Fellow and Dean of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, and Hon. Canon of Derby.

Mr Scott-Craig is Professor in the Department of English at Hobart College, U.S.A.

The Rev. K. N. Ross is Vice-Principal of Salisbury Theological College.

Mr Short is Warden of the Settlement for Adult Education at Letchworth.

Mr Symons is H.M. Inspector of Factories at Stoke-on-Trent. He was a member of the Economics Section of the Oxford Conference (1937) on Church, Community and State.

NOTES

Thanks to the good management of the publishers, we have not until now had to reduce the size of Theology to meet the shortage of paper, and even now, when some reduction has become essential, we are fortunate in not having to reduce the number of pages each month by more than sixteen out of eighty. The rising costs of production have also required careful consideration, but the reduction in size just mentioned and also the willingness of our contributors to forgo the modest remuneration that they have been receiving make it possible not to raise the price. Readers will be glad to know that the circulation of Theology has steadily increased during the past eighteen months. The best way in which they can help to ensure against future difficulties is by continuing to secure new subscribers. We depend on our present readers, and not on advertising, for this purpose.

In welcoming our contemporary *Horizon* Mr T. S. Eliot recently remarked: "The best way in which people of modest means can support literature is to *subscribe* to reviews of this kind—to subscribe to anything, in these days, which preserves any independence, whether you like its opinions or not. People

always seem to expect other people to do the subscribing; but it is the subscriptions, not the casual sales, that make independent journalism possible." (*New English Weekly*, February 15, 1940.)

The Editor is always glad to receive letters, whether of criticism or of appreciation, about the contents of THEOLOGY. Limitations of space, however, will restrict, now more even than in the past, the amount of correspondence which he can publish.

Radical Religion—the American quarterly edited by Dr Reinhold Niebuhr—has changed its title to *Christianity and Society*. Its price in England is 4s. per annum, and it can be obtained from the Rev. Alan Richardson, Annandale, North End Road, London, N.W. 11.

THE BRITISH CHAPLAINCY AT LISBON, 1656-1939

THE present English Chaplaincy of Lisbon, which is among the oldest in Europe, was founded by a clause in the Treaty of Alliance, 1656, between Cromwell and John VI of Portugal, allowing the English the exercise of their faith and to maintain a graveyard.

The history is continuous except for short periods—1662-68, 1700-09, 1714-21 and 1734-43—when the records are at present missing.

1. ZACHARY CRADDOCK, 1656-60 (Emmanuel, Cambridge, and Fellow of Queens').—He was appointed by Cromwell on nomination by Ralph Cudworth. The Inquisition forbade an English church, and service was held in the Envoy's house till 1815. The claim of the Consul to this right in an Envoy's absence was a standing cause of friction. Craddock did not get on well with Maynard, the Consul, and was summoned before the Inquisition on a charge of interference with a "relapsed heretic." He returned to England 1660. The merchants later asked him to return, but Maynard prevented it. He was later Chaplain to Charles II and Provost of Eton. He died 1698.

2. THOMAS MARSDEN, 1661-65 (Brasenose, Oxford).—In 1661 the Bishop of London took up the question of the Lisbon appointments. Fanshawe, the Envoy, suggested that, if the Consul profited by a vacancy, they might be numerous, and indeed Marsden and Maynard soon had difficulties; and except for occasional duty by Chaplains to the British force in Portugal an interregnum occurred 1665-78. In this the arrangement was made that the "Lisbon Factory"—*i.e.*, the corporation of London merchants trading with Lisbon—appointed, the Bishop licensed and the Crown approved. Later the Secretary of State appointed direct, asking local opinion.

3. MICHAEL GEDDES, 1678-88 (Edinburgh and Balliol, Oxford).—In 1686 he had trouble with the Inquisition "for

holding services at a house where you have prayers and sermons on Sundays and Holydays." Geddes pleaded privilege under the 1656 Treaty. The Inquisition replied, " We have never known of it, and if we had we should not have suffered it." Geddes and the Consul and merchants appealed to Bishop Compton of London (then a prisoner in the Tower), who did not answer. Geddes, being suspended, returned to England, and services were resumed 1688 with a new Envoy. The Dutch were not interfered with, and the incident seems a local result of James II's church policy. Geddes was a prolific author, many of his books dealing with Portugal. He died 1713.

4. John Colbatch, 1688-1700 (Fellow of Trinity, Cambridge).—A correspondent of Bishop Burnet of Salisbury, for whom he visited and described an *auto-da-fé* at Lisbon. A letter of his was found in the British Museum 1938, which gives much information on Lisbon, but is mainly an attack on the Envoy, Sir Paul Methuen, who made the " Methuen Treaty " 1703. Colbatch was later Tutor of Trinity and Professor of Moral Theology at Cambridge 1707-44. He was prominent in the disputes between Richard Bentley and the Trinity Fellows 1714. He died 1746.

In the gap, 1700-09, the chaplaincy was accepted by Jonathan Swift, but he did not come to Lisbon, for an unknown reason.

5. Joseph Wilcocks, 1709-14 (Fellow of Magdalen, Oxford).—" While he was at Lisbon there was a great outbreak of smallpox; though he had never had the disease, he remained at his post, and ministered to the sick and dying."

On returning to England he became Chaplain to George I, and later Bishop of Gloucester 1721-31, and Rochester 1731-56, and Dean of Westminster as well. As Dean he made the last addition to the Abbey, building the two western towers from Wren's designs. He died 1756.

6. Joseph Simms, 1721-31 (St Catharine's, Cambridge).—In his incumbency the present cemetery was bought by the English and Dutch, and the first extant registers begun, 1721. The first entry of interest is " Richard Welton," 1726, a " Non-Juror Bishop," the first Anglican to exercise episcopal functions in America.

An Act, 1723, founded the " Contribution Fund," a tax levied by the Consul on certain goods imported by English merchants, which provided the Chaplain's salary and aid for distressed seamen and other British subjects. Simms was later Domestic Chaplain to Bishop Wilcocks and died 1776.

7. Staveley Parker, 1743-49 (Fellow of Jesus, Cambridge).—Died at Lisbon 1749.

8. John Williamson, 1749-63 (Balliol, Oxford, and Fellow of the Royal Society of Scotland, an astronomer of some note).—Lisbon in the eighteenth century was a popular British health resort, and Williamson buried Dr Doddridge, the hymn writer,

1751, and Henry Fielding, the novelist, 1754. The Great Earthquake occurred at Lisbon November 1, 1755; and 80 British are known to have perished, but no entry records it. Mr Williamson kept his registers very badly. He died at Lisbon 1763.

9. William Allen, 1763-82 (Trinity, Cambridge).—To judge by his registers, Mr Allen was keenly interested in the numerous negro slaves of the British colony in Lisbon. He died 1782.

10. Herbert Hill, 1782-1808 (Fellow of Christchurch, Oxford).—He was Chaplain of Oporto before Lisbon. He married the Margrave of Brandenburg to Baroness Craven 1791, and also buried the Prince of Waldeck, lent to reorganize the army of Portugal, 1798. He was Chaplain to the British force in Lisbon 1798-1801.

The present Chaplain's house, originally a hospital, then used by the French as a prison, was built in his incumbency. Hill left Lisbon 1807, on the French invasion, and was later Canon of Hereford and Rector of Streatham. He died 1828.

Hill is interesting as the uncle of Robert Southey, the author, whose education, at Westminster and Oxford, he paid for. Southey stayed with him in Lisbon, 1791-1802, and he used Hill's fine library of Portuguese and Spanish books very largely for his writings on the Peninsula.

1808-11 is a register-gap that unfortunately coincides with the early Peninsular War. A few graves date from the period, when the graveyard was extended to its present limits, 1810, as the Military Cemetery. Tradition says many British soldiers' bones were buried here from the various Peninsular battlefields.

11. Robert Marrat Miller, 1811-18 (Wadham, Oxford).—He recommenced the registers 1811. They record the burial, 1811, of Brigadier Coleman, which caused a lively skirmish between the merchants and the Duke of Wellington. The marriage register records the marriage of a Scots officer and a Spanish lady, "doubts having been raised as to the validity of a previous marriage at San Sebastian in Spain, September, 1813."

The Inquisition having lost power, it was decided to build a church in the graveyard 1815, and a temporary church was used 1815-20.

12. Thomas Hurford Siely, 1819-40 (Caius, Cambridge).—The new church, "St George's," was used from 1824, but required rebuilding in 1837-39. The "Consular Act, 1824," put the salary on a new basis, Government giving half and the merchants through a committee raising the rest, with the church expenses. The committee and Mr Siely had continual difficulties till he was induced to resign 1840.

13. George Sayle Prior, 1841-61.—Bishop Tomlinson of Gibraltar consecrated the church August 13, 1840, and a

school was opened and the hospital given as a parsonage 1841.

14. Thomas Kenworthy Brown, 1861-69 (Christ's, Cambridge).—The last Chaplain appointed by the Bishop of London's licence.

15. Thomas Godfrey Pembroke Pope, 1869-1902 (Trinity College, Dublin).—Canon of Gibraltar 1882. In 1874 all Government support to the chaplaincy was withdrawn, and appointment, salary, and control were vested in a local committee elected by subscribers. In 1885 the church was burnt down and rebuilt, being consecrated by Bishop Sandford, March 17, 1887. Canon Pope was a liturgical scholar and drew up the Prayer Book for the "Lusitanian Church." He died 1902.

16. Richard Hawkesley Westall, 1902-07 (St Edmund's Hall, Oxford).—King Edward VII attended St George's on Palm Sunday, 1905.

17. Edward Pilcher Lewis, 1907-15 (Exeter, Oxford).

18. Joseph Henry Morton Nodder, 1915-24 (St Augustine's, Canterbury).—Formerly a missionary in Burma. In 1914 he was Chaplain in Dresden. He died 1925 in Buda Pesth.

19. Charles Hamilton Dobson, 1925-30 (Chaplain to New Zealand E.F., Gallipoli and France).—As Chaplain of Smyrna, 1922, he distinguished himself at the Evacuation before the Turks entered, and was thanked by King George V for his services. He died at Lisbon 1930.

20. Cyril Gerald Holland, 1930-35 (University College, Durham).

21. Herbert Pentin, 1936-37 (Hatfield Hall, Durham, Canon of Gibraltar).—As Chaplain of Lisbon he carried through a reform of the Church Constitution.

22. Henry Frank Fulford Williams, 1937 (Clare, Cambridge).—Formerly Chaplain India Ecclesiastical Service.

Note.—A full record is in the archives of St George's Church, Lisbon, and the Chaplain will be glad to give further information to any inquirer.

H. F. Fulford Williams
(*Chaplain of St George's, Lisbon*).

CORRESPONDENCE

BUSSELL'S BAMPTON LECTURES

To the Editor of Theology.

Sir,

Mr F. J. E. Raby's article in your May number on John Neville Figgis is a just tribute to a prophet whose prescience the march of events has only too fully justified. There is yet

another prophet, to whom Figgis himself was greatly indebted and whom he freely quotes, who seems to be but little read in these days, but whose Bamptons for 1905, *Christian Theology and Social Progress*, very clearly expounded the main points at issue between Christianity and the world.

Their author, the late F. W. Bussell, intended them as an essay in Christian apologetic. " It is my aim," he writes in the preface, " to show how general welfare is bound up with the faiths and hopes of Christian belief; and again, how the general welfare can only rightly be secured by justice to the particular, by respecting the units which make up the whole: a heap composed of valueless atoms is itself without value."

Like Figgis, Bussell knew his Nietzsche and saw in his false idealism an irrational but dangerous rival to Christianity. He exposes the peril to the individual in the exaltation of the State or the Race, and devotes much of his space to demonstrating that Christianity alone satisfies one of the deepest instincts in humanity—namely, that which claims work and worth for the individual.

The lectures, written in a most attractively allusive style, concise and pregnant, with frequent flashes of mordant wit, are followed by numerous supplementary lectures, amplifying and elucidating the discussion of points raised in the lectures themselves. These supplementaries, though rather ill-arranged, are full of good matter.

Yours faithfully,
E. Lisle Marsden.

The Vicarage,
Grimsby,
May 21, 1940.

SURVEY

CHRISTIAN SOCIAL THOUGHT

It is not unknown for Catholics (in the particular sense, including both Anglicans and Romans) to dismiss political democracy lightly. It is therefore significant to find a book written by a group of Catholics of the Roman Church dealing directly with the subject of democracy. Such a book is *For Democracy* (Burns Oates, 8s. 6d.). This is a good book; but its value lies not so much in the depth of its analyses as in its unambiguous support of the democratic position. The writers maintain that the premises of the Christian religion " include the responsibility of each individual to exercise his free will, to *choose*. A pattern of life that is dictated by another, no matter how intrinsically good it is in itself, does not satisfy the religious demand for the voluntary obedience to the divine will." The book reveals not merely an academic acquaintanceship with democratic ideas, but also practical experience of democratic movements. Its authors distinguish between the essentials of democracy and its temporary manifestations. There is full appreciation of the necessary part taken by free associations outside the organs of government. The analytical sections, however, are weakened by a failure to consider sufficiently precisely the nature of social power. Hence there is a tendency to talk in general terms about " liberty," but to fail to consider the insights of democracy in relation to particular centres of power. Yet surely this is the crux of the problem for the Christian. Each man is a child of God: as such he has a life to live and may not be made a mere tool. But also each man is a sinner, always liable to use his fellows for his own ends. It is just this dual insight into the nature of man which is central to Christian ethics, and which leads at once to a criticism of the nature and exercise of power. Democracy does not consist alone in liberty and in the exercise of free choice by the individual; it is also concerned with the achievement of responsibility in the organs of government.

Many of the major questions affecting democracy to-day occur in industry. But the treatment of this subject in the book is disappointing—for just the reason to which reference has already been made. In one chapter Louis Terrenoire outlines a " corporate " organization of industry. He has some wise things to say about the dangers to democracy latent in the enormous centralization of power involved in a thoroughgoing State Socialism. But his argument is weakened and his con-

clusions made doubtful by a failure to examine accurately the nature and economic functions of the " corporations " which he advocates. The term is apparently used mainly for organized occupational groups, such as trade unions and employers' associations—although the Port of London Authority, which can hardly be described as a vocational group, turns up rather unexpectedly. The writer's main assertion is that the detailed control of industrial life, within a general legal framework imposed by the State, should be in the hands of self-constituted and largely autonomous corporations of employers and workers. This arrangement, he asserts, would be in keeping with democracy. Is this true? It is certainly true that voluntary occupational groups—trade unions and professional associations—play a vital part in democracy. But to hand the operation of industry to such groups may be rash indeed. The very examples which M. Terrenoire quotes indicate the risk. It is only necessary to study the working of the N.R.A. in America or the boot and shoe industry in England to see how readily even a very mild corporatism affords the opportunity for employers and workers to exploit the rest of the community by means of a high price and wage policy and by stagnation of technique. For it must be recognized clearly that trade unions, no less than employers' associations, are sectional organizations concerned with the interests of special groups within society. To hand over to such organizations essentially monopolistic powers and to hope that they will not be misused is to have an altogether too optimistic view of the ways of sinful men!

The writers fail to relate the principles which they discuss to the organization of the Church—yet surely they are relevant there, too. It was not a pure accident (as one writer seems to imply) that John Milton was both a democrat and a Puritan. If irresponsible power, wielded by sinful man, is dangerous in the structure of society, it is dangerous in the Church. Is not the highly centralized hierarchic control of the Roman Church and the " parson's freehold " of Anglicanism subject to the same criticism as political autocracy? Many democrats ignore this question, for they ignore the Church. But if we know the Church as the Divine instrument of man's salvation, mediating God to man, yet having its treasure in earthen vessels, then indeed this question is vital. It would be good to hear these writers on the subject.

Democracy cannot claim the authoritative support of the faith as the " only Christian way," for it falls, like all man-made schemes, under the judgment of God. Yet this book witnesses that the insights which have formed democracy, and which give it relative importance at the present time, are too deep-rooted in the Christian faith to be the property of any one confession.

The book we have just discussed raises one question which is so important that it deserves further treatment—that is, the

failure of most ecclesiastical and academic writers dealing with the relationship between religion and democracy to draw adequately on the very rich body of practical experience contained in the British "working-class movement." Two other books, recently reviewed in these pages, which reveal the same gap are Middleton Murry's *The Price of Leadership* and T. S. Eliot's *The Idea of a Christian Society*. The writers do not discount this experience; they write as though it did not exist. Perhaps this is understandable. The working-class movement, with its strangely linked life of dissenting congregations, of trade unions and co-operative societies, of adult education and political activity, looks unprepossessing from outside—like many of the Nonconformist chapels and co-operative stores which it has created! Its fruits are to be seen, not in learned writings, but in the lives and actions of working men and in the institutions which they have built up. But there are, in Christian history, few richer veins of experience for those who wish to trace the practical relations between religion and social institutions—especially democratic institutions—in both success and failure.

The Oxford Conference (1937) made a solid contribution to Christian ethical thinking. That much is widely recognized. But the generalized, theoretical and highly concentrated form of the reports makes it difficult for them to bear fruit in ordinary parish life. For those who are conscious of this difficulty *Christians in Society*, by Edwin Barker and Ronald Preston (S.C.M. Press, 5s.), should make welcome reading. It is not a profound and carefully finished sociological treatise; indeed, it bears many marks of hurried writing under the pressure of current events. But it is one of the few attempts to develop in practical terms the ethical theory contained in the report of the Economics Section of the Oxford Conference.

The writers stand in the biblical tradition; they know God as at once *ethical* and *transcendent*. God's commands are to be obeyed by response in practical life—in shop and factory—but no such response can be authoritatively pronounced to be God's will. "Two errors . . . there are to which Christians are very prone. The first considers all systems of justice and all possible choices as so inferior to religious experience as to justify refusal to make a choice. The second identifies such choices as are made with the will of God. . . . Choose we must, but the choice we make is *our* choice."

There are two main weaknesses, the writers assert, which stultify much Christian moral effort—"individualism" and "utopianism." By "individualism" is meant the concern with individual attitudes and the neglect of social effectiveness. "Not one of the major problems of life to-day is amenable to effective action except in and through political action. Nothing effective can be done with regard to wages, hours and conditions of workers . . . except through powerful unions,

federations of employers or political parties." "Utopianism" is the concern with ultimate ideals, and the failure to discriminate between *practical* alternatives. "In general, the Christian does not create the alternative lines of conduct between which he has to choose. . . . Much less is the choice even between that which is obviously . . . good and that which is in direct contradiction to the Gospel. There is no 'Christian' solution for us to adopt, and, consequently, in choosing the best alternative we cannot thereby be said to be compromising." What, then, are the strategic points for Christian moral effort? In trying to answer this question the writers recall what the Church often seems to have forgotten during the last few centuries. "One of the assumptions of this book is that industrial and commercial organization and the relations which develop between men in the processes of earning a living determine the main outlines of social organization and the main characteristics of social relationship." What happens in factory and mine matters to most people more than what happens in churches; that may not be a palatable fact for us, but it is true.

A chapter of peculiar importance because it deals with a subject commonly ignored is that entitled "Why Christians Differ." We often hear from the pulpit the assertion that moral and political decisions are basically religious. But if that is so, how is it that moral and political lines of division run, not parallel to, but across religious and theological frontiers? In practical life we are often aligned against our fellow Christians and in company with strange religious bedfellows. The writers deal carefully and honestly with this question.

The final chapters of the book contain some valuable material on the work of the Churches. Our Christian religion demands a response, not only in the sanctuary, but also in the workshop. This means, not that the Churches should enter vaguely into all kinds of political activities, but that Christians should see very clearly the scope of the activities of the organized Churches, of associated bodies bearing the label "Christian," and of individual Christians within secular institutions. To quote briefly: "Although *discussion* takes place in the Christian Fellowship, the sphere of *action* (for the Christian) is in secular political and social organizations." The Church's job is "not to issue authoritative regulations nor primarily to make pronouncements. It cannot be too often emphasized that these are not its crucial contributions."

Professor Zimmern's *Spiritual Values and World Affairs* (Oxford University Press, 7s. 6d.) is a book which is based on similar ethical principles to the last, although questions of ethical theory are much less explicitly discussed. It is a valuable book, and deserves treatment fuller than can be accorded here, and treatment by someone who is versed in international affairs.

Professor Zimmern writes vividly and emphasizes by pertinent examples the dangers which arise from moralizing without technical knowledge. A sentence is worthy of reproduction: " In order to play his part in Cæsar's world, the Christian needs on the one hand . . . to out-Cæsar Cæsar on his own ground, and on the other . . . to keep open his line of communication with his own spiritual base." The main defect of the book is an inadequate appreciation of the place of the " prophetic " element in religion, which shows itself in a partially justified but shallow attack on Christian pacifism.

An excellent short book is *Morality and War*, by Fr Gerald Vann, O.P. (Burns Oates, 3s. 6d.). The writer approaches the subject in the legalistic manner which is natural to the Roman Church. The book is noteworthy in that the writer has a vivid appreciation of the difficulties involved in both the pacifist and the non-pacifist positions, so that there is nothing facile about his writing.

In its publication of a novel by Cedric Belfrage (*Let My People Go*), the Left Book Club has made one of its rather rare entries into the religious field. The narrative recalls an earlier book—*The Inside of the Cup*, by Winston Churchill—for it recounts the spiritual pilgrimage of an American pastor from a narrow orthodoxy and moral legalism to the American " social Gospel." The comparison is of interest politically: the two books symbolize the gap between the dates at which they were written, for the earlier book ends with a belief in liberal democracy, whereas the hero of the later book passes through this stage to a Marxian socialism. But religiously the later book is peculiarly superficial. The hero discards his early " fundamentalism " and finds his home in a " modernism " vaguer and more untheological than that expounded in *The Inside of the Cup*. The whole theological movement of the day, in which a critical ethical judgment finds its basis on a substantial theological orthodoxy, is completely ignored. The writer cannot be accused of not having heard of Reinhold Niebuhr, for he mentions him by name, but he writes as though he, together with all the main theologians of our time, had never lived. None the less, the book is worth reading for its vivid picture of industrial and race conflict in the U.S.A.

A very useful factual book is a report to the King George's Jubilee Trust, written by Dr A. E. Morgan, entitled *The Needs of Youth* (O.U.P., 10s. 6d.). This is a comprehensive survey of the factors influencing young persons and of the facilities, both statutory and voluntary, available to meet their needs. The book inclines perhaps to paternalism—it implies that organized activities are always better than talking at the street corner ! But its value as a reference book is undoubted, and it should be available to every parish priest.

Students of hagiology may find both value and entertainment in a comparison of the way in which Christians and Marxists recount the lives of their respective "saints." An example of the latter is the life of *Rosa Luxemburg*, by Paul Fröhlich (Left Book Club). An account of martyrdom on the other side is Fr Carreras' book, *The Glory of Martyred Spain* (Burns Oates, 6s.). These books are propaganda—but what books are not?

A. G. Lee's *Christianity in Chains* (Longmans, 6s.) should be reviewed from the theological rather than the social angle. It is an attempt to construct a "new modernism" which takes count of present-day attacks on liberal thought. The writer realizes (like Paul Tillich in an earlier and greater book) that the student of religious thought needs to look outside as well as inside the Churches. But the book is weakened by an inadequate grasp of the central dogmas of the Faith.

W. G. Symons.

BOOK REVIEWS

THE PSALMS. Translated, with text-critical and exegetical notes, by W. O. E. Oesterley. Two volumes. S.P.C.K., 1939. 32s.

Professors Oesterley and T. H. Robinson have already produced three joint-works on Old Testament subjects. In *The Psalms* they have collaborated again, but Dr Oesterley has taken the lion's share, and Dr Robinson, who supplies four introductory chapters and translations of, and comments on, twenty-two Psalms (55-60, 68, 73-84, 86, 88, 90), is not mentioned on the title page.

Readers of the earlier works will know what to expect, and they will not be disappointed. Here are the same merits and the same limitations. The authors have read widely and are anxious to make use of all that they have read. Their book is well arranged. First comes a selected bibliography; next, fourteen chapters of introduction, four (the origin and growth of the Psalter: the classification of the Psalms: the forms of Hebrew poetry: text and versions) by Dr Robinson, ten (the titles of the Psalms: the Psalms and the literature of the Ancient East: the Kingship of Yahweh: saints and sinners in the Psalms: the question of Maccabean Psalms: the theology and the religious teaching of the Psalms: the Psalms in the New Testament: the Psalms in the Jewish Church: the Psalms in the Christian Church: the history of the exegesis of the Psalms) by Dr Oesterley; finally, each Psalm receives separate treatment in the following form: (*a*) brief general introduction; (*b*) translation, in the margin of which the Hebrew verse-numbers are given in brackets where they differ from those of the English versions—a great aid to the student; (*c*) text-critical notes which mention (but do not attempt to justify) any emendation of the Hebrew text on which the translation rests; (*d*) exegetical notes; (*e*) religious teaching. There is a good general index; any information the book contains can be easily found; it is easy to use, and, in spite of some curiously constructed sentences (*e.g.*, "to champion such an innovation demanded an intensity of religious conviction engendered by a development of conception regarding the Being of God which is very impressive," p. 270), not difficult to read. In chapter iv Dr Robinson gives a useful summary of the work done by Lowth and Gray on the forms of Hebrew poetry; in chapter ix and elsewhere Dr Oesterley makes good use of his knowledge of Rabbinical literature, and his comments constantly reveal a devout Christian believer.

In these respects the book has great merits; in others it is open

to criticism. One of them is its failure to make sufficiently clear to the general reader (for whom, according to its wrapper, it is partly intended) which of the things which are being taken for granted rest upon a solid foundation of evidence, and which upon guess-work. " The Enthronement of Yahweh was the initial ceremony . . . performed at one of the great feasts " (p. 45). " This is the first of a group of . . . Psalms sung at the ceremony of Yahweh's Enthronement " (p. 414). The general reader who meets unqualified statements like these naturally supposes " the ceremony of Yahweh's Enthronement " to be a well-known and generally acknowledged item in the religious rites of Ancient Israel. It would surprise him to hear the opinion, recently expressed by one of the most competent living scholars, that it has not been proved, and it is not likely that there ever was such a ceremony.

Similar passages in which things which are really matters of conjecture (plausible or otherwise) are spoken of as if they were simple matters of fact occur elsewhere in the book—*e.g.*, " the world-wide belief in the return of the Golden Age," p. 52; " the Zadokites displaced the Ithamar priesthood from the position of precedence," p. 61; " *Ś'buth* means the ' restoration ' in reference to the ' bringing back ' of the primeval time of happiness," p. 92; " the reference (in Psalm xxviii, 8) is . . . to the Babylonian Creation myth," p. 188; " as is well-known these (*i.e.*, apocalyptic ideas) were taken over and adapted by the prophets from Babylonian mythology," p. 254; " the hosts (in the title ' Lord of Hosts ') meant originally the heavenly hosts, later they were made to refer to the armies of Israel," p. 257; " the king referred to (in Psalm lxiii) can only be Jehoiachin," p. 305; " the Feast of Tabernacles, with its mimic presentation of the divine war that led to creation, and of the marriage, death and resurrection of the life-giving deity," p. 380; (the psalmist's) " conception of the Almighty as clothed with majesty and honour through the brilliancy of light . . . was taken from ancient Iranian belief . . . in the very next sentence the psalmist gives utterance to a different idea, adapted from Babylonian cosmology," p. 442; " the moon was at one time their (*i.e.*, the Semites') chief deity," p. 443.

The remaining points in the book which invite criticism may be called minor blemishes. Some of the introductory chapters are very slight, and it is strange that a section on " Universalism " should contain no reference to the most universalistic of all the Psalms (lxxxii and lxxxvii). The bibliography contains the names of solid works, slight works, exercises for research degrees, and " crank " books: it would have helped the reader to be told which are which. Most of the translations are quite satisfactory, but occasional renderings are not exactly happy (*e.g.*, " step with giant stride," lxxiv, 3; " my voice was Godward ! and I cried," lxxvii, 1; " will the Lord cast off to eternity ?" lxxvii, 7;

" thou hast fumed at the prayer of thy people . . . thou hast made us drink tears by large measure . . . thou drivedst out nations . . . its shadows covered mountains and its boscage cedars of God," lxxx, 4, 8, 10; " thou hast brought back the restoration of Jacob," lxxxv, 1). Some of the emendations adopted need further justification. Some of the exegetical notes are homilies attached to the text rather than expositions of it, and some of the arguments used in exposition are not wholly convincing (*e.g.*, " all people would not be called upon to clap . . . unless they had all been subdued by Yahweh," p. 259). Not every reader will be able to see as much evidence as Dr Oesterley sees of the psalmist's belief in a future life, and some will feel that, while Dr Oesterley attaches rather too much importance to the ideas contained in the second of Mowinckel's *Psalmenstudien*, he does rather less than justice to those contained in the first. There is much to be said for the theory that the " enemies " who laid the souls of various psalmists in the dust are not real people at all, but the imagined causes of their sickness and misfortunes.

Dr Oesterley's book will no doubt be read by many young students who cannot read German. It will give them some idea of what German-writing scholars (especially Gunkel and Mowinckel) have been saying about the Psalter during the last twenty or thirty years. If it is something less than a complete critical survey, it is at least a useful interim report.

F. S. Marsh.

Two Lives of St Cuthbert: A Life by an Anonymous Monk of Lindisfarne and Bede's Prose Life. Text, translation, and notes by Bertram Colgrave. Cambridge University Press. 21s.

It is something of a relief at a time when most literature seems somewhat ephemeral, and when the destinies of nations are in the melting-pot, to open a book which is neither a *critique* of totalitarianism, nor yet another attempt to expose the private life of Herr Hitler. Mr Colgrave has done history and scholarship in general a service by his edition of the Anonymous Life of St Cuthbert and Bede's Prose Life of the saint. Even for those who do not, like Mr Colgrave, live under the shadow of Durham Cathedral, there is enough that is basically important and transcendent in the life of the greatest of the Northern Saints to make such a collection as this more than a contribution to the annals of hagiology alone. Apart from the importance of their central subject, these two Lives of St Cuthbert, as their latest editor claims, " throw considerable light on the secular history of the golden age of Northumbria," and " also illustrate one of the most important periods in the history of the English Church."

Mr Colgrave has studied, for purposes of collation, forty-three main MSS—seven for the Anonymous Life and thirty-six for Bede's Life. The result is, therefore, probably as exhaustive an edition as is possible, and one of the most valuable parts of the present work under review is the section on the MSS themselves, which for its comprehensiveness and clarity alike must be recommended as a model to all scholars interested in the technique of collation.

The Anonymous Life, which belongs to the turn of the seventh century, is a typical piece of hagiography, based on popular legend and worked up into shape by an unknown writer on the usual plan of such Lives. The result is, therefore, very much what we should expect to find, with certain characteristic incidents giving it an individuality of its own—the bearing of the soul of Aidan to heaven, for example, and the historical sections which provide us with details concerning St Cuthbert's life and migration, bearing every stamp of veracity and local authentication. Bede's Prose Life is longer altogether, but the earlier work is professedly its basis. In a way it is somewhat reminiscent of an undergraduate's essay, for the author has carefully turned and altered words and phrases so as to give an impression of originality—a perfectly allowable method, of course, for the medieval historian to use, though the result in this case is not always very satisfactory, and there is more than one passage in which Bede has greatly weakened the force and simplicity of the earlier narrative by his verbose and tortuous amplification of it. Nevertheless, in spite of certain drawbacks, it is a valuable document, and if we must judge the Anonymous Life chiefly from the hagiographical point of view, the criteria which we may in the main apply to the Prose Life will be historical, for Bede makes up for his shortcomings in other directions by a lucidity of arrangement and by detailed accounts of certain events for which he is the main authority. Mr Colgrave is to be congratulated not only on the scholarship which alone could make such an edition possible, but also on the way in which he has made accessible to the interested general reader the comparison of two exceedingly interesting texts.

Beatrice Hamilton Thompson.

The Mystical Theology of St Bernard. By Etienne Gilson. Translated by A. H. Downes. Sheed and Ward. 10s. 6d.

This book, which is based upon lectures given by Professor Gilson in 1933, first in his own country and then at Aberystwyth, consists first of an essay setting forth the "systematics" of St Bernard's mysticism, and then of a series of studies of men and movements around him, followed by full notes and bibliography. The weight of scholarship behind the book is so immense that a

person but slenderly acquainted with twelfth-century thought could not have attempted the task of reviewing it, were it not that the author is himself as humble as the saint whom he interprets, and in the essay, which occupies about two-thirds of the book's 266 pages, gives us an outline of St Bernard's teaching in which depth and simplicity go hand in hand, and the wayfaring man, though a fool, walks in the path prepared for him with sheer delight. With the telescopic power that marks the true historian the author brings his subject before us close and clear. We see St Bernard at Citeaux, taking the Benedictine Rule for no more than that which St Benedict himself called it, a "little Rule for beginners," and proceeding at the direction of its final chapter to seek the perfection of religious and indeed of human life through the guidance of Holy Scripture and the Fathers of the Church. From these, M. Gilson shows us, he derived the profound theological bases upon which his mystical teaching rests—namely, the twin doctrines of man made in God's image and of God Himself as Love. "Know thyself," the key precept of Cistercian life, means therefore not merely recognize thy misery as fallen, but know thy human *dignitas* as a free-willed creature; and the whole progress of the soul consists in the development, under Love's attraction, of the germinal image of love into the perfect Likeness for which it was created. In thus presenting St Bernard's mysticism as ultimately rooted in theology M. Gilson breaks new ground, for most writers hitherto have regarded it as purely practical. It must be left to his intellectual peers to judge how far he is right here, as also of his opinions on the relations of St Bernard to his age; but it may be surmised that there are not many qualified to meet him on his own ground, and, on the face of it, to anyone who knows anything of the Fathers—Irenæus, for instance, with whom the distinction between the image and the Likeness originates, and Athanasius who develops it—it seems surprising that anyone should ever have thought a rootless mysticism possible. Certainly the ordinary Christian, concerned only how to live his life in this troublesome world, is profoundly in M. Gilson's debt for this lovely, gracious book, that recalls us with such exquisite lucidity to the things that belong unto our peace. There is, however, a further field opened up by it, which we long to see explored. M. Gilson traces the immediate antecedents of St Bernard's thought chiefly in the First Epistle of St John and in certain of the later Fathers, but he does not, indeed he could not in a single book, attempt to trace these same ideas back to their ultimate source. Yet when St Bernard speaks of the "curvature" of human nature, alienated from God who is Love, one cannot but remember that it is in the Old Testament that to sin first means to go crookedly or to err, that the word for happiness comes from a root meaning to go straight forward, and that the character of God is summed up

in the four great qualities *çedheq* and *mishpaṭ*, *ḥeṣedh* and *'emeth*,[1] none of them adequately to be rendered by any one English word, yet all of them together giving a wonderful presentment of the meaning of Love. Will not some English divine with whom, as with M. Gilson, scholarship is the handmaid of devotion, work out this theme of our dependence on the elder Church, and send his book over the Channel to repay to France something of our debt for this?

A Member of C.S.M.V.

Psychology and Psychotherapy. By William Brown (4th edition). Edward Arnold. 12s. 6d.

Christian Healing. By Evelyn Frost. Mowbray. 15s.

This fourth edition of Dr William Brown's well-known book deserves some short notice here because it is more than a reprint. It has been considerably revised and new chapters have been inserted on the psychology of middle life, and on sublimation. Thus it has all the freshness of a newly written book, and its wide range, extending beyond psychotherapy to the problems of culture, politics and religion, makes it a very interesting one.

Miss Frost's book is of a very different kind. It is primarily a work of elaborate patristic scholarship, its purpose being to show in detail the clear-cut belief of the Christian Church during the first three centuries. The evidence is given very fully and arranged with great care. The book falls into five parts. In the first the Ante-Nicene doctrine of Christian Healing is stated; in the second it is investigated in relation to modern knowledge; in the third the place of suffering in the light of the Resurrection is studied in the light of Ante-Nicene evidence; in the fourth this also is related to modern knowledge; in the fifth certain constructive deductions and practical suggestions are offered. In each part there is a full synopsis, followed by short chapters leading to a summary of the evidence, and with appendices citing all the relevant passages in an English translation.

The result is rather difficult to read and the book has its main importance, perhaps, as a work of reference. As there is no index it is a little difficult to find one's way about, and this might have been made easier if cross-references had been attached to the synopses. The duplicating of the patristic evidence, first summarized and then in detail, adds to this cumbrous effect.

To that criticism must be added another. Some of the evidence is stated rather naively. Thus it is said of St Polycarp that "it is difficult to find the true facts . . . but there seems to be evidence for his coming through the fire unharmed."

---

[1] *E.g.*, in Psalm lxxxix, 15.

The evidence is simply that the *Martyrium* says so, with very picturesque detail. Miss Frost's phrase " seems to be " is really confusing. So again it seems to be assumed that the tower of Siloam fell " because of the lack of conscientious work on the part of the builders." Why not simply from old age? The point of the story may lie deeper than Miss Frost has seen.

But when these points are made the book remains a most valuable one, both in its collection of evidence and in its suggestions towards a modern reconstruction. These deserve fuller comment than space allows. It must suffice to say that Miss Frost appears as an advocate of sacramental healing, and that her advocacy is of real weight and distinction.

L. W. GRENSTED.

LEONTIEV. By N. Berdyaev. Centenary Press. 10s. 6d.

Leontiev is barely a name to the English reader who should be grateful, apart from its authorship, for this study of a singular and vivid figure.

Constantine Leontiev (1831-91) is presented by M. Berdyaev as the first Russian æsthete, a romantic with a passion for the exotic and picturesque nourished by residence in the Near East, a lover of luxury, dissolute and " incredibly sensual."

At the age of forty a dangerous illness provoked a religious crisis; he burnt his MSS, resigned his consulateship and went on pilgrimage to Mount Athos. But it was not till the last months of his life that he took monastic vows, though for some years he had lived next door to the Optina Monastery an ambiguous life, half squire, half monk. It would be easy but unjust to say that his appreciation of the monastic life was merely a part of his æstheticism, a substitution of " the poetry of religion " for that of " elegant immorality." There was a genuine religious struggle, a duality never wholly resolved. The dominant motive in his religion was fear; fear of sin, of death, of damnation; he was deeply concerned, in a " transcendental egoism," with his personal salvation. " There was," says M. Berdyaev, " an ascetic poverty about his religiosity." Those elements of Orthodoxy which most strike the western Christian, *sobornost*, Easter joy, the idea of transfiguration, were foreign to him. The Orthodoxy he admired was Byzantine, authoritative, ascetic, hierarchical, a religion of " discipline and disillusionment." He rarely mentions Christ or the Kingdom of God. His biographer suggests, indeed, that he did not *desire* the coming of the Kingdom; it would mean " the elimination of contrast and variety and polarity " from the world. He was indifferent to " suffering humanity "; that savoured too much of humanitarianism, of a " sugar-coated " religion. It meant the levelling process of nineteenth-century democracy,

abhorrent alike to his aristocratic and artistic sensibilities. Socialism, nationalism, panslavism are similarly attacked because they mean equality, uniformity, a mass-produced humanity, the triumph of " vulgarity and prose." Progress was a pathological process: the disintegration of the " flowering complexity " of European culture, a breakdown of the hierarchical and cosmic structure of society, a return to chaos. Socialism would " put an end to history, having destroyed humanity." But this was the attempt of the sociologist trained in the naturalism of his age, to justify the horror of the æsthete and the romantic at the decay of the variety, colour and contrast of the old aristocratic and patriarchal cultures (Turkish as well as Christian) which he saw in Constantinople.

Leontiev starts from the æsthetic criterion which he regarded as superior to the ethical as being of wider application. His defect is that he never quite got beyond it. He is attracted to Orthodoxy because he finds in it confirmation for a particular set of values. But he makes fundamentally the same mistake as the humanitarians whom he criticizes (and others); he reduces Christianity to his own standards.

This " Nietzchean Christian," as M. Berdyaev calls him, is more likely to have a hearing to-day than he received in his own times. We are reminded in some ways of T. E. Hulme; with this difference, that Leontiev would be more ready to " swallow the dogma for the sake of the sentiment." He did not, thinks M. Berdyaev, solve his own problems, and he has no solution for ours. But the issues he debated—racialism, socialism, the relation of religion and culture—are current issues, and because he discussed them with acuity and prescience (striking predictions of modern political tendencies will be found, notably on pp. 100 ff. and 185) he remains a lively intellectual stimulant, and M. Berdyaev's critical but not unsympathetic study is of unusual interest.

J. D. C. Pellow.

SHORTER NOTICES

Towards a Pattern. By Gwen St Aubyn. Longmans. 3s. 6d.

This is a regrettable little book, not because the author's spiritual pilgrimage, here described in letters, ended in Rome, but because she found so little when she got there. From first to last she is far more interested in herself and her own sensations than in God, and seems to have had little regard for any appeal other than the emotional and the æsthetic in any of the various forms of Christianity of which she has made trial. We do not think, therefore, that this book need be put on the danger list

for the unsettled, for, though sincere as far as it goes, the argument is of the flimsiest: indeed, to many cases of Roman fever one might almost recommend it as a cooling draught. Certainly, as a convinced Anglican, one feels really sorry that the claims of the great Church of Rome should not have been more worthily presented.

A Member of C.S.M.V.

This Spiritualism. By C. J. Seymour. Longmans. 5s.

This book is a very clear and honest account of an inquiry into the truth of Spiritualism, conducted by one who started as a sceptic and who in the end came to be very completely convinced. The evidence given does not differ greatly in kind from that which is to be found in many other Spiritualist writings, but there is also a real attempt to answer some of the very difficult questions which arise. In particular the evidence of prediction by the "guides," and its failure in some noteworthy instances, is fairly faced and seriously discussed. The main value of the book lies in its sincerity as a faithful account of the experiences it records.

L. W. Grensted.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(*Mention here neither implies nor precludes subsequent mention.*)

Allen and Unwin: Gilbert Murray, *Stoic Christian and Humanist* (5s.); E. Shillito (Ed.), *An Outline of Church History* (4s. 6d.).

Blackwell: J. W. Hunkin, *The Spirt of Man and the Spirit of God* (2s.).

Burns and Sons (Glasgow): E. Anscombe and N. Daniel, *The Justice of the Present War Examined* (6d.). "A criticism based on traditional Catholic principles and on natural reason."

Cape: M. Chaning Pearce (Ed.), *Federal Union* (10s. 6d.); G. C. Leybourne and K. White, *Education and the Birth-rate* (10s. 6d.).

Dacre Press: E. L. Mascall, *The God-Man*, Signposts, No. 5 (1s.).

Hodder and Stoughton: J. Garstang, *The Story of Jericho* (8s. 6d.).

Inter-Varsity Fellowship: A. Schlemmer, *The Crisis in the World of Thought* (1s.).

Kegan Paul: K. Mannheim, *Man and Society* (16s. 6d.).

Longmans: P. Carnegy, *The Assurance of God* (7s. 6d.); C. J. Seymour, *This Spiritualism* (5s.); K. T. Henderson, *Prayers of Citizenship* (3s. 6d.); H. A. Wilson, *Your Faith—or Your Life* (3s. 6d.).

Pax House: A. H. Rees, *The Worship of God* (3s. 6d.).

Prieuré d'Amay-sur-Meuse (Belgium): Dom C. Lialine, *De la Méthode irénique* (6 fr.).

Sands: Anon., *Happiness in Marriage* (2s. 6d.).

Printed in Great Britain by
Billing and Sons Ltd., Guildford and Esher